131

ANECDOTES

OF

THE LIFE

OF

RICHARD WATSON,

BISHOP OF LANDAFF;

WRITTEN

BY HIMSELF AT DIFFERENT INTERVALS,

AND

REVISED IN 1814.

PUBLISHED BY HIS SON,
RICHARD WATSON, LL. B.
PREBENDARY OF LANDAFF AND WELLS.

Second Edition.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

THE TANJORE MAHARAJA SERFOGI'S

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR T. CADELL AND W. DAVIES, STRAND;
BY J. M'CREERY, BLACK-HORSE-COURT.

1818.

J. M'Creery, Printer,
Black Horse Court, London.

TANJORE MAHARAJA SERFOGI'S SARASVATI MAHAL

ANECDOTES OF THE LIFE

OF

RICHARD WATSON,

BISHOP OF LANDAFF.

IT has been a custom with me, from a very early age, to put down in writing the most important events of my life, with an account of the motives which, on any occasion of moment, influenced my conduct. This habit has been both pleasant and useful to me; I have had great pleasure in preserving, as it were, my identity, by reviewing the circumstances which, under the good Providence of God, have contributed to place me in my present situation; and a frequent examination of my principles of action has contributed to establish in me a consistency of conduct, and to

confirm me, I trust, in that probity of manners, in my seventy-fifth year, with which I entered into the world at the age of seventeen. My health has been for several years precarious; and the faculty have long ago left my constitution to struggle with a disorder which first seized me in 1781. The body and mind, I begin to perceive, are both of them losing their activity; the *evil days* are coming on in which men usually say, *there is no pleasure in them;* may I not be allowed, then, without incurring the imputation of vanity, to live, in a manner, an happy life (for which I am most thankful to its Author) over again, by collecting and arranging some of the detached papers which I have written at different periods? By this means my children, when I am in my grave, may be gratified with knowing the character of their father; and the world, if it has any curiosity concerning him, will have an opportunity of perusing authentic, if not interesting, Memoirs of the Bishop of Landaff.

All families being of equal antiquity, and

time and chance so happening to all, that kings become beggars, and beggars become kings; no solid reason, I think, can be given, why any man should derive honour or infamy from the station which his ancestors filled in civil society; yet the contrary opinion is so prevalent, that no words need be employed in proving that it is so. —German and Welch pedigrees are subjects of ridicule to most Englishmen; yet those amongst ourselves who cannot inscribe on the trunk of their genealogical tree the name of a peer, bishop, judge, general, of any person elevated above the rank of ordinary citizens, are still desirous of showing that they are not sprung from the dregs of the people. Without entering into a disquisition concerning the rise of this general prejudice, I freely own that I am, on this occasion, a slave to it myself. I feel a satisfaction in knowing that my ancestors, as far as I can trace them, have neither been *hewers of wood*, or *drawers of water*, but *ut prisca gens mortalium*—tillers of their *own* ground, in the idiom of the country, *Statesmen*.

I was born at Heversham, in Westmoreland, in August, 1737, and always retained a strong partiality for the place of my nativity. My father was born at Hardendale, near Shap, in the same county, in the year 1672. His father, grandfather, great grandfather, &c. were natives of the same place; and, according to the *then* simplicity of the times, they preserved their innocence, and maintained their independence, by cultivating a small estate of their own. It appears from Grose's Antiquities, that, when the Monastery of Shap was dissolved by Henry the Eighth, of the thirteen monks who were in it, two had the name of Watson. These ecclesiastics were probably dedicated to the church by some of my progenitors, and I can give no further account of any of them, except I mention the tradition, that the first of the family, who settled near Shap, came from Scotland.

My grandfather's little patrimony was inherited by my father's elder brother, who died, leaving only daughters: and it is, I

believe, without having suffered alienation, still in the possession of their descendants. In 1698, my father was appointed head-master of Heversham School, which he taught with great reputation for nearly forty years. If schoolmasters may properly be allowed to participate in the honours of those whom they have educated, the greatest honour of my father's life will be the education of Ephraim Chambers. In Heversham Church, adjoining to the chancel, there is an inscription "In memory of Mary, the wife of Richard Chambers, who died in the year 1684, which Richard was father of Ephraim Chambers, author of the celebrated Dictionary of Arts and Sciences."—I have seen among my father's papers two school-exercises, the one in Latin, the other in Greek, signed Chambers. These circumstances render it probable that the author of the dictionary was not, as has been said of him, merely educated to qualify him for trade and commerce. There are two exhibitions (now of *50l.* a year each) belonging to this school, one to Trinity College in Cambridge, and the other to Queen's

College, Oxford. I succeeded my school-fellow Mr. Preston in the enjoyment of that to Trinity College, and when we were both of us Bishops in 1788, we agreed, at a joint expense, to repair the school-house, which was much dilapidated. I then drew up the following inscription, to be kept as a token of our regard for the place of our education, and as a tribute of respect to the memory of its pious founder, and to that of my father, under whom Mr. Preston had received his first rudiments:

Hanc Scholam fundavit
Amplisque reditibus annuis dotavit
Edvardus Wilson
De Heversham-Hall Armiger
MDCXIII
Elapsis centum et amplius annis
Sepe et vallo conclusit
Et circumcirca arboribus consitis condecoravit
Thomas Watson
Ab anno 1698vo usque ad annum 1737um
ΟΥΚ Ο ΤΥΧΩΝ ΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΟΣ
Vetustate tandem fere collapsam
Suis sumptibus refici curaverunt
Ejusdem olim simul alumni
Ricardus Watson Episcopus Landavensis
et
Gulielmus Preston Episcopus Fernensis
MDCCLXXXVIII

The success of every school depends upon the ability and industry of the master, and the reputation of this soon sunk with my father's resignation of it, which took place before I was born. I was never at any other, and have had cause, through life, to regret my not having had a better classical foundation. It has fallen to my lot, not only to be obliged to write, but to speak Latin, and having never been taught to make Latin or Greek verses, it cost me more pains to remember whether a syllable was long or short, than it would have done to comprehend a whole section of *Newton's Principia*. My mind indeed recoiled from such enquiries; what imports it, I used to say to myself, whether *Cicero* would have said *fortūito* or *fortŭito*—*Areopăgus* or *Areopāgus?* and yet I was forced to attend to such things; for a Westminster or an Eton schoolmaster would properly have thought meanly of a man who did not know them. My hands have shaken with impatience and indignation, when I have been consulting Ainsworth or Labbe about a point, which I

was certain of forgetting in a month's time. But as I never could remember the face or name of a man or woman whose character did not strike me, so I found it difficult to impress on my memory rules of prosody which I had acquired a contempt for; nor did this contempt arise so much from my ignorance of the subject (for I had, after leaving school, taken great pains not to be ignorant of it), as from the undue importance which was given to it. I was confirmed in this sentiment by observing, that the greatest adepts in syllables were not exempt from mistakes. I remember two of the best scholars in the university, Rutherforth and Sumner, in the course of a few weeks, pronouncing in the senate-house the *penultimam* of μακαριτης long and short. On another occasion my friend Mr. Wilson, of Peterhouse, (afterwards one of the best black-letter judges in England,) having kept under me a very good act in the divinity schools, was censured by two great classics, Bishop of Peterborough and Dr. Symonds, for having read *abolĭta* instead of, as they thought, *abolīta*. Even

the very learned Mr. Bryant, with whom I was conversing in 1802, on the subject of man's redemption, spoke of *Jesus* as the μεσῐτης of the new covenant; on my expressing a doubt as to the quantity of the middle syllable, he said no more; but on his going to Eton (that noble mart of metre) he sent me word that it ought to be pronounced μεσῑτης from its analogy to οδῑτης for which he had found authority. Had my father's faculties remained unimpaired till I had been sent to the University, it is probable that I should have had no occasion to lament a defective education in prosody, for he was esteemed an excellent grammarian, and in his time boys were prepared for the University, by being taught at school to converse in Latin. I once overheard an old man who had been his scholar say in a passion, to his fellow-labourer, *Frangam tibi caput*——but enough of such things: from not being used to them in my youth, I may think of them with less respect than I ought.

My father died in November, 1753, and

had been afflicted much with a palsy for several years before. I have heard him ask twenty times in a day, what is the name of the lad that is at College; (my elder brother;) and yet he was able to repeat, without a blunder, hundreds of lines out of classic authors. This reminiscence of ideas, formerly impressed on the brain, and forgetfulness of recent ones, is no unusual circumstance attending a paralysis, though our physiology is not yet enough advanced, to enable us to account for it. Soon after the death of my father, I was sent to the University, and admitted a Sizar of Trinity College in Cambridge, on the 3d of November, 1754. I did not know a single person in the University, except my tutor, Mr. Backhouse, who had been my father's scholar, and Mr. Preston, who had been my own schoolfellow. I commenced my academic studies with great eagerness, from knowing that my future fortune was to be wholly of my own fabricating, being certain that the slender portion which my father had left to me (300*l.*) would be barely sufficient to carry

me through my education. I had no expectations from relations; indeed I had not a relation so near as a first cousin in the world, except my mother, and a brother and sister who were many years older than me. My mother's maiden name was Newton; she was a very charitable and good woman, and I am indebted to her (I mention it with filial piety) for imbuing my young mind with principles of religion, which have never forsaken me. Erasmus, in his little treatise entitled *Antibarbarorum*, says that the safety of states depends upon three things—Upon a proper or improper education of the prince, upon public preachers, and upon school-masters; and he might with equal reason have added, upon mothers; for the care of the mother precedes that of the school-master, and may stamp upon the *rasa tabula* of the infant mind, characters of virtue and religion which no time can efface.

I had not been six months in college before a circumstance happened to me, trivial in itself and not fit to be noticed, except

that it had some influence on my future life, inasmuch as it gave me a turn to metaphysical disquisition. It was then the custom in Trinity College (I am sorry it is not the custom still) for all the undergraduates to attend immediately after morning prayers the college-lecturers at diffe-rent tables in the hall, during term-time. The lecturers explained to their respective classes certain books, such as *Puffendorf de Officio Hominis et Civis,* Clarke on the Attributes, Locke's Essay, Duncan's Logic, &c., and once a week the head-lecturer examined all the students. The question put to me by the head-lecturer was, Whether *Clarke* had demonstrated the absurdity of an infinite succession of changeable and dependent beings? I answered, with blushing hesitation, *Non*. The head-lecturer, Brocket, with great good-nature, mingled with no small surprise, encouraged me to give my reasons for thinking so. I stammered out in barbarous Latin (for the examination was in that language), That Clarke had enquired into the *origin* of a series which, being from the supposition

eternal, could have no origin; and into the *first* term of a series which, being from the supposition *infinite,* could have no first. From this circumstance I was soon cried up, very undeservedly, as a great metaphysician. When four years afterwards, I took my bachelor's degree, Dr. Law, then master of Peterhouse, and one of the best metaphysicians of his time, sent for me, and desired that we might become acquainted. From my friendship with that excellent man, I derived much knowledge and liberality of sentiment in theology; and I shall ever continue to think my early intimacy with him a fortunate event in my life.

Perceiving that the sizars were not so respectfully looked upon by the pensioners and scholars of the house, as they ought to have been, inasmuch as the most learned and leading men in the University have ever arisen from that order, (*Magister artis, ingenîque largitor venter*) I offered myself for a scholarship a year before the usual time of the sizars sitting, and succeeded,

on the 2d of May, 1757. This step increased my expenses in college, but it was attended with a great advantage. It was the occasion of my being particularly noticed by Dr. *Smith*, the then Master of the College. He was, from the examination he gave me, so well satisfied with the progress I had made in my studies, that out of the sixteen who were elected scholars, he appointed me to a particular scholarship (Lady Jermyn's) then vacant, and in his own disposal; not, he said to me, as being better than other scholarships, but as a mark of his approbation; he recommended *Saunderson's Fluxions*, then just published, and some other mathematical books, to my perusal, and gave, in a word, a spur to my industry, and wings to my ambition.

I had, at the time of being elected a scholar, been resident in college for two years and seven months, without having gone out of it for a single day. During that period I had acquired some knowledge of Hebrew; greatly improved myself in Greek and Latin; made considerable

TANJORE MAHARAJA SERFOJI'S SARASWATI MAHAL LIBRARY

proficiency in mathematics and natural philosophy; and studied with much attention Locke's works, King's book on the Origin of Evil, Puffendorf's Treatise *de Officio Hominis et Civis,* and some other books on similar subjects; I thought myself therefore entitled to a little relaxation: under this persuasion I set forward, May 30th, 1757, to pay my elder and only brother a visit at Kendal. He was the first curate of the new chapel there, to the structure of which he had subscribed liberally. He was a man of lively parts, but being thrown into a situation where there was no great room for the display of his talents, and much temptation to convivial festivity, he spent his fortune, injured his constitution, and died when I was about the age of thirty-three; leaving a considerable debt, all of which I paid immediately, though it took almost my all to do it.

My mind did not much relish the country, at least it did not relish the life I led in that country-town; the constant reflection that I was idling away my time mixed

itself with every amusement, and poisoned all the pleasures I had promised myself from this visit; I therefore took an hasty resolution of shortening it, and returned to College in the beginning of September, with a determined purpose to make my *Alma Mater* the mother of my fortunes. *That,* I well remember, was the expression I used to myself, as soon as I saw the turrets of King's College Chapel, as I was jogging on a jaded nag between Huntingdon and Cambridge.

I was then only a *junior soph;* yet two of my acquaintance of the year below me, thought that I knew so much more of mathematics than they did, that they importuned me to become their private tutor. To one of them (Mr. Luther) it will be seen hereafter how much I am indebted; and with the other (Dr. Strachey) I have maintained through life an uninterrupted friendship. May I meet them both in Heaven! I undoubtedly wished to have had my time to myself, especially till I had taken my degree: but the narrowness of

my circumstances, accompanied with a disposition to expense, or, more properly speaking, with a desire to appear respectably, induced me to comply with their request. From that period, for above thirty years of my life, and as long as my health lasted, a considerable portion of my time was spent in instructing others without much instructing myself, or in presiding at disputations in philosophy or theology, from which, after a certain time, I derived little intellectual improvement.

Whilst I was an under-graduate, I kept a great deal of *what is called* the best company—that is, of idle fellow-commoners, and other persons of fortune—but their manners never subdued my prudence; I had strong ambition to be distinguished, and was sensible that, though wealth might plead some excuse for idleness, extravagance, and folly in others, the want of wealth could plead none for me.

When I used to be returning to my room at one or two in the morning, after

spending a jolly evening, I often observed a light in the chamber of one of the same standing with myself; this never failed to excite my jealousy, and the next day was always a day of hard study. I have gone without my dinner a hundred times on such occasions. I thought I never entirely understood a proposition in any part of mathematics or natural philosophy, till I was able in a solitary walk, *obstipo capite atque exporrecto labello,* to draw the scheme in my head, and go through every step of the demonstration without book or pen and paper. I found this was a very difficult task, especially in some of the perplexed schemes, and long demonstrations of the Twelfth Book of *Euclid,* and in *L'Hôpital's* Conic Sections, and in *Newton's Principia.* My walks for this purpose were so frequent, that my tutor, not knowing what I was about, once reproached me for being a lounger. I never gave up a difficult point in a demonstration till I had made it out *proprio Marte;* I have been stopped at a single step for three days. This perseverance in accomplishing whatever I un-

dertook, was, during the whole of my active life, a striking feature in my character, so much so that Dr. Powell, the Master of St. John's College, said to a young man, a pupil of mine, for whom I was prosecuting an appeal which I had lodged with the visitor against the college,—" Take my " advice, sir, and go back to your curacy, " for your tutor is a man of perseverance, " not to say obstinacy." After a perseverance however of nearly three years, the appeal was determined against the College; the young man (Mr. Russel) was put in possession of the Furness Fells Fellowship, which I had claimed for him, as a propriety-fellowship; and the college was fined *50l.* for having elected another into it. It would be for the public good if all propriety-fellowships, in both Universities, were laid open; and Dr. Powell (for whose memory I have great veneration) was, I doubt not, influenced by the same opinion, when he attempted to set aside this propriety; Dr. Kipling, whom he had elected into it, being in ability far superior to Mr. Russel: but the legislature alone is com-

petent to make such a change, and till it is made by proper authority, the will of every founder ought to be attended to.

But though I stuck closely to abstract studies, I did not neglect other things. I every week imposed upon myself a task of composing a theme or a declamation in Latin or English. I had great pleasure in lately finding among my papers, two of these declamations, one in English, the other Latin; there is nothing excellent in either of them, yet I cannot help valuing them, as they are not only the first of my compositions of which I have any memorial remaining, but as they show that a long commerce in the public world has only tended to confirm that political bent of my mind in favour of civil liberty, which was formed in it before I knew of what selfish and low-minded materials the public world was made.

The subject of the English declamation is, " Let tribunes be granted to the Roman people;" that of the Latin, " *Sociis Italicis*

detur civitas:" both of them were suggested to my mind from the perusal of *Vertot's Roman Revolutions,* a book which accidentally fell into my hands. Were such kind of books put into the hands of kings during their boyhood, and Tory trash at no age recommended to them, kings in their manhood would scorn to aim at arbitrary power through corrupted parliaments.

I generally studied mathematics in the morning, and classics in the afternoon; and used to get by heart such parts of orations either in Greek or Latin as particularly pleased me. Demosthenes was the orator, Tacitus the historian, and Persius the satirist, whom I most admired.

I have mentioned this mode of study, not as thinking that there was any thing extraordinary in it, since there were many under-graduates then, and have always been many in the University of Cambridge, and for aught I know, in Oxford too, who have taken greater pains. But I mention it, because I feel a complacence in the re-

collection of days long since happily spent; *hoc est vivere bis vitâ posse priore frui,* and indulge an hope, that the perusal of what I have written may chance to drive away the spirit of indolence and dissipation from young men; especially from those who enter into the world with as slender a provision as I did. I will mention another circumstance, which happened to me before I took my first degree, that I may put young men upon their guard against self-sufficiency of opinion, and induce them to make, at a more mature age, a cool examination into the origin of their principles and belief.

Our opinions on many important subjects are formed as much on prejudice as on reason; and when an opinion is once taken up, it is seldom changed, especially in matters not admitting any criterion of certainty. When I went to the University, I was of opinion, as most school-boys are, that the soul was a substance distinct from the body, and that when a man died, he, in classical phrase, breathed out his soul, *ani-*

mam expiravit ; that it then went I knew not whither, as it had come into the body, from I knew not where, nor when ; and had dwelt in the body during life, but in what part of the body it had dwelt I knew not. So deep-rooted was this notion of the flight of the soul somewhither after death, as well as of its having existed somewhere before birth, that I perfectly well remember having much puzzled my childish apprehension, before I was twelve years old, with asking myself this question,—Had I not been the son of Mr. and Mrs. Watson, whose son should I have been? The question itself was suggested in consequence of my being out of humour, at some slight correction which I had received from my mother. This notion of the soul was, without doubt, the offspring of prejudice and ignorance, and I must own that my knowledge of the nature of the soul is much the same now that it was then. I have read volumes on the subject, but I have no scruple in saying, that I *know* nothing about it.

Believing as I do in the truth of the Christian religion, which teaches that men are accountable for their actions, I trouble not myself with dark disquisitions concerning necessity and liberty, matter and spirit; hoping as I do for eternal life through Jesus Christ, I am not disturbed at my inability clearly to convince myself that the soul is, or is not, a substance distinct from the body. The truth of the Christian religion depends upon testimony; now man is competent to judge of the weight of testimony, though he is not able I think fully to investigate the nature of the soul; and I consider the testimony concerning the resurrection of Jesus (and that fact is the corner-stone of the Christian church) to be worthy of entire credit. I probably should never have fallen into this scepticism on so great a point, but should have lived and died with my school-boy's faith, had I not been obliged as an opponent, in the philosophical schools at Cambridge in 1758, to find arguments against the question; *Anima est suâ naturâ immortalis?*—in turning

over a great many books in search of arguments against this *natural* immortality of the soul, I met with an account (I do not know in what author, but there is the same, or a similar one mentioned in the French Encyclopedie not then published, art. *Mort,*) of a man who came to life after having been for six weeks under water. This account, whether true or false, suggested to me a doubt concerning the soul's being, as I had till then without the least hesitation conceived it to be, not a mere quality of the body, but a substance different in kind from it. I thought one might in some measure account for the restitution of motion and life, to a body considered as a machine, whose motions had been stopped without its fabric being destroyed; but I could not apprehend the possibility of recalling a soul which had left the body, with its last expiration, for the space of six weeks. I mention not this with a view of supporting the materiality of the soul, or the contrary, but merely to shew upon what trifling circumstances our opinions are frequently formed;—a consideration

this, which should teach us all to speak with candour of those who happen to differ from us, and to abate in ourselves that dogmatizing spirit, which often impels learned men to impose on others their own inveterate prejudices as incontrovertible truths.

I argued with myself at that time, when I was fond of such speculations, in the following manner:—A table is matter, and a tree is matter; but the matter of the table is different from that of the tree which furnished the wood from which the table was made. A tree is living matter, and a table is dead matter; life then, in whatever it may be supposed to consist, is that which constitutes an essential difference between a table and a tree. Again, a tree is matter, and an oyster is matter, and both of them are living matter; yet the matter of the tree is different from that of the oyster: the matter of the tree being only (as is generally supposed) living matter, whilst that of the oyster is not only living but percipient matter; percepticity then, however it may be produced, is that which

constitutes an essential difference between an oyster and a tree. Again, an oyster is matter, and a man is matter, and both of them are percipient matter; yet the matter of the oyster is different from the matter of the man, the matter of the oyster being only (as is generally supposed) percipient matter, whilst that of a man is not only percipient but thinking matter; the faculty of thinking, then, however it may be produced, is that which constitutes an essential difference between a man and an oyster. The essential properties of extension, solidity, mobility, divisibility, and inactivity, are common properties belonging equally to the table, the tree, the oyster, and the man; but to these common properties are added to the matter of the tree, life; to that of the oyster, life and perceptivity; to that of the man, life, perceptivity, and thought. Whether life can exist without perceptivity, or perceptivity without thought, are subtle questions, not admitting, perhaps, in our present state, a positive and clear decision either way. Physical and metaphysical difficul-

ties present themselves on every subject, and ultimately baffle all our attempts to penetrate the darkness in which the Divine Mind envelopes his operations of nature and grace. "*Hardly do we guess aright at things that are upon earth, and with labour do we find out the things that are before us, but the things that are in Heaven who hath searched out?*" (Wisd. of Sol. ix. 16.)

In January, 1759, I took my Bachelor of Arts' degree. The taking of this first degree is a great æra in academic life; it is that to which all the under-graduates of talents and diligence direct their attention. There is no seminary of learning in Europe in which youth are more zealous to excel during the first years of their education than in the University of Cambridge. This observation, however, is true only concerning those who are obliged to take their Bachelor of Arts' degree, and at the usual time; the rest being stimulated by no prospect of honour, may chance, indeed, to excel; but by a foolish custom of the University their genius is neglected; they

are neither impelled by the fear of shame, nor the hope of glory, resulting from scholastic exertion.

I was the second wrangler of my year, the leading moderator having made a person of his own College, and one of his private pupils, the first, in direct opposition to the general sense of the examiners in the Senate House, who declared in my favour. The injustice which was then done me was remembered as long as I lived in the University; and the talk about it at the time did me more service than if I had been made senior wrangler. Our old master sent for me, and told me not to be discouraged, for that when the *Johnians* had the disposal of the honours, the second wrangler was always looked upon as the first.

There was more room for partiality in the distribution of honours, not only with respect to St. John's, but other Colleges, *then,* than there is now; and I attribute the change, in a great degree, to an alteration which I introduced the first year I was

moderator, and which has been persevered in ever since.

At the time of taking their Bachelor of Arts' degree, the young men are examined in classes, and the classes are *now* formed according to the abilities shown by individuals in the schools. By this arrangement, persons of nearly equal merits are examined in the presence of each other, and flagrant acts of partiality cannot take place. Before I made this alteration, they were examined in classes, but the classes consisted of members of the same College, and the best and the worst were often examined together.

The first year I was moderator, Mr. Paley (afterwards known to the world by many excellent productions, though there are some ethical and some political principles in his philosophy which I by no means approve,) and Mr. Frere, a gentleman of Norfolk, were examined together. A report prevailed, that Mr. Frere's grandfather would give him a thousand pounds, if he were senior wrangler: the other mo-

derator agreed with me in thinking, that Mr. Paley was his superior, and we made him senior wrangler. Mr. Frere, much to his honour, on an imputation of partiality being thrown on my colleague and myself, publicly acknowledged, that he deserved only the second place; a declaration which could never have been made, had they not been examined in the presence of each other.

Paley, I remember, had brought me for one of the questions he meant for his act, *Æternitas pœnarum contradicit Divinis attributis?* I had accepted it; and indeed I never refused a question either as moderator or as professor of divinity. A few days afterwards, he came to me in a great fright, saying, that the master of his College (Dr. Thomas, Dean of Ely,) had sent to him, and insisted on his not keeping on such a question. I readily permitted him to change it, and told him, that if it would lessen his master's apprehensions, he might put in *non*, before *contradicit*, and he did so. Dr. Thomas, I had little doubt, was afraid

of being looked upon as an heretic at Lambeth, for suffering a member of his college to dispute on such a question, notwithstanding what *Tillotson* had published on the subject many years before.

It is, however, a subject of great difficulty. It is allowed on all hands that the happiness of the righteous will be, strictly speaking, everlasting; and I cannot see the justness of that criticism which would interpret the same word in the same verse in different senses. "And these shall go away into *everlasting* punishment, but the righteous into *everlasting* life." Mat. xxv. 46. On the other hand, reason is shocked at the idea of God being considered as a relentless tyrant, inflicting everlasting punishment, which answers no benevolent end. But how is it proved that the everlasting punishment of the wicked may not answer a benevolent end, may not be the mean of keeping the righteous in everlasting holiness and obedience? How is it proved that it may not answer, in some other way unknown to us, a benevolent

end in promoting God's moral government of the universe?

In September, 1759, I sat for a fellowship: at that time there never had been an instance of a Fellow being elected from among the Junior Bachelors. The master told me this as an apology for my not being then elected, and bade me be contented till the next year. On the first of October, 1760, I was elected a Fellow of Trinity College, and put over the head of two of my seniors of the same year, who were however elected the next year. The old master, whose memory I have ever revered, when he had done examining me, paid me this compliment, which was from him a great one,—"You have done your duty to the College, it remains for the College to do theirs to you." I was elected the next day, and became assistant tutor to Mr. Backhouse in the following November.

About the same time I was offered by the Vice-Chancellor the curacy of Cler-

mont, and advised to accept it, as it would give me an opportunity of recommending myself to the Duke of Newcastle, then Chancellor of the University: but then and always prizing my independence above all prospects, I declined accepting the offer. I might also soon after have gone chaplain to the Factory at Bencoolen, and I would have gone, but that I wanted several months of being able to take priest's orders. The master of the College hearing of my intention sent for me, and insisted on my abandoning my design, adding, in the most obliging manner, "You are far too good to die of drinking punch in the torrid zone." I had then great spirits, and by learning, as I purposed, the Persian and Arabic languages, should probably have continued but a short time chaplain to the Factory. I have thanked God for being disappointed of an opportunity of becoming an Asiatic plunderer. I might not have been able to resist the temptation of wealth and power, to which so many of my countrymen have unhappily yielded in India.

I took my Master of Arts' degree at the Commencement in 1762, and was made Moderator for Trinity College in the following October. I look upon the office of Moderator to be the most difficult to execute, and the most important to the interests of the University, when well executed, of any that there is, not excepting the Professorship of Divinity itself. If in any thing we are superior to Oxford, it is in this, that our scholastic disputations in philosophy and theology are supported with seriousness and solemnity. An evil custom has, within these few years, been introduced into the University, which will in its consequences destroy our superiority over Oxford, and leave our scholastic exercises in as miserable a state as theirs have long been. It is the custom of dining late. When I was admitted, and for many years after, every College dined at twelve o'clock, and the students after dinner flocked to the philosophical disputations, which began at two. If the schools either of philosophy or divinity shall ever be generally destitute of an audience, there will be an end of all

scholastic exertion. I remember having seen the divinity-schools (when the best act (by Coulthurst and Milner—*Arcades ambo*) was keeping that I ever presided at, and which might justly be called a real academic entertainment,) filled with auditors from the top to the bottom; but as soon as the clock struck three, a number of masters of arts belonging to colleges which dined at three slunk away from this intellectual feast; and they were followed, as might have been expected, by many under-graduates,—I say as might have been expected; for, in all seminaries of education, relaxation of discipline begins with the seniors of the society.

Some persons may contend that scholastic exercises are of no use; I think very differently; but without entering into any discussion on the subject, I will content myself with putting down some of the questions which were subjects of disputation in the *Sophs'* school, in 1762. There is no one, I believe, who has a proper knowledge of these questions, but must be sensi-

ble of the utility of having young men's minds occupied in the study of such subjects. I have transcribed the questions from the Moderator's book for 1762, which I happen to have in my possession.

Objectiones in Algorithmum fluxionum, quales ab analystâ proponuntur, falsis innituntur principiis?

Methodus primarum ac ultimarum rationum, a Newtono adhibita, est sana methodus ratiocinandi, et a methodo indivisibilium prorsus distincta?

Recte statuit Newtonus de motu corporum, in orbibus mobilibus versus centrum immotum attractorum?

Si corpus urgeatur motu projectili, et vi centripetâ variante in reciprocâ duplicatâ ratione distantiæ, movebitur in aliqua sectionum conicarum, umbilicum habente in centro virium?

Motus planetarum omnium solvi possint ex theoriâ gravitatis?

Recte statuit Newtonus de motuum Lunarium inæqualitatibus?

Generalia æstuum phænomena solvi possint ex theoriâ gravitatis?

Theoria Newtoniana de caudis cometicis est admittenda?

Motus aquæ e foramine quam minimo in fundo vasis cylindrici uniformiter prosilientis, recte definivit Newtonus?

Pulsibus per fluidum propagatis singulas fluidi particulas, motu reciproco brevissimo euntes ac redeuntes, accelerari semper et retardari pro lege penduli in cycloide moventis non demonstravit Newtonus?

Pulsibus, &c. ut in antecedente propositione recte demonstravit Newtonus?

Aberrationes stellarum fixarum solvi possint ex motu lucis progressivo et motu telluris in orbitâ suâ?

Momenta corporum sunt ut velocitates et quantitates materiæ conjunctim?

Perforatâ tellure, corpus intra eam movens eâdem lege acceleratur et retardatur, quâ pendulum vibrans in cycloide?

Phænomena ventorum tropicorum solvi possint ex rotatione telluris circa proprium axem, et motu puncti maxime rarefacti?

Cursus ventorum inter tropicos spirantium solvitur ab Hadleio?

Projectilia, amota medii resistentia, describunt parabolas?

Phænomena terræ motuum solvi possint ab ignibus subterraneis?

Vibrationes ejusdem penduli in cycloide sunt Isochronæ?

Lunæ horizontalis phænomenon nondum solvitur?

Lunæ horizontalis phænomenon solvitur a Smithio?

Systema Copernicanum est verum mundi systema?

Recte statuit Halleius de origine fontium?

Motus solis circa proprium axem ex motu ejus macularum colligi potest?

Recte statuit Jurinus de tubis capillaribus simplicibus?

Phænomenon mercurii in barometro solvi potest ex gravitate et elasticitate aëris?

Datur, in rerum naturâ, necessaria connexio inter judicia nostra de variis distantiis ejusdem visibilis objecti, et distantias ipsas?

Non datur in rerum, &c. ut in anteced.

Dei existentia probari potest ex eo quod est motus?

Deus ultimus est et auctor et conservator motûs?

Ordo mundi probat Deum?

Dei existentia non admittit demonstrationem a priori?

Absurditatem infinitæ seriei entium dependentium non satis demonstravit Clarkius?

Omnia Dei moralia attributa ad unam ejus sapientiam recte possint referri?

Jus Dei in creaturas non solum fundatur in irresistibili ejus potentiâ?

Origo mali moralis solvi potest, salvis Dei attributis?

Æternitas pœnarum non contradicit Divinis attributis?

Præscientia Divina non tollit libertatem agendi?

Status futurus colligi potest ex lumine naturæ?

Status futurus non, &c. ut in anteced.

Recte statuit Humius statum futurum non colligi posse ex Dei justitia?

Sublato statu futuro, nulla manet ad virtutem obligatio?

Sublato statu futuro, manet ad virtutem obligatio?

Datur sensus innatus moralis?

Non datur sensus innatus moralis?

Recte statuit Lockius de humanâ libertate?

Non recte statuit Lockius de humanâ libertate?

Voluntas non determinatur ab extra?

Moralis scientia demonstrationis est capax?

Recte statuit Berkleius de principiis humanæ scientiæ?

Spatium non est aliquid reale?

Non dantur abstractæ ideæ?

Reales essentiæ rerum, re verâ existentium nobis ignotæ sunt?

Imperium civile oritur ex pactis?

Omnes homines sunt naturâ æquales?

Jus servitutis non fundatur in rerum naturâ?

Homines a muneribus publicis non recte excluduntur ob religiosas opiniones?

Homines, qui dissentiunt a religione lege stabilitâ, muneribus publicis jure repelluntur?

Rationi consentaneum est et reipublicæ prodest, ut nemini pœna infligatur ob religiosas opiniones?

Supremo magistratui resistere licet, si respublica aliter servari nequit?

Jus non competit civitati in vitas subditorum?

Juri gentium repugnat, ut medii bellicosas apparatus gentibus bellum gerentibus suppeditent?

Licet principi subditos alienos contra gravem et manifestam injuriam defendere?

Contra crescentem potentiam, quæ nimium aucta nocere possit, non licet arma sumere?

Leges in civitate, quæ monomachiam prohibent, recte instituuntur?

Clamores populi libertatem stabiliorem reddunt?

Libertas imprimendi in Anglicano imperio est admittenda?

Recte statuit Lockius de distinctis fidei et rationis provinciis?

Privata felicitas est ultimus moralium actionum finis?

Formalis ratio virtutis consistit in conformitate ad Dei voluntatem?

In res, quæ singulorum sunt propriæ, jus omnibus competit extremæ necessitatis?

Ex præsenti rerum statu, morale Dei imperium colligi potest?

Ideæ immediatâ voluntatis actione excitari non possunt?

Phænomena somniorum explicari nequeunt ex materiâ et motu?

Phænomena somniorum solvuntur ab ideis nuper receptis a statu corporis, et ab idearum associatione?

Anima est immaterialis?

These specimens of the questions, which engaged the attention of our young men above half a century ago, may be sufficient to give a proper idea of the importance of scholastic exercises, as one mean of a good education. The depths of science, and the liberality of principles in which the University of Cambridge initiates her sons, would, had he been acquainted with them, have extorted praise from Mr. Gibbon himself.

In the end of the year 1763, I was again appointed Moderator, in the room of a person of St. John's College, who, after a trial of presiding in the schools for the first term, had resigned through infirmity.

On the 12th of February, 1764, I received a letter informing me that a separation had taken place between my friend

Mr. Luther, then one of the Members for Essex, and his wife, and that he was gone hastily abroad. My heart was ever warm in friendship, and it ordered me, on this occasion, to follow my friend. I saw he was deserted and unhappy, and I flew to give him, if possible, some consolation. I set off from Cambridge on the same day I had received the account. I could read, but I could not speak a word of French; I had no servant nor any money; I presently borrowed fifty pounds, and bought a French and English Dictionary, and thus equipped, I went post to Dover, without so much as knowing whether my friend was gone to France, and from thence, almost without sleeping, I got to Paris and enquired him out.—The meeting was such as might have been expected. I did not stay above twelve hours in Paris, but immediately returned to England, and, after a variety of accidents and great fatigue, for I crossed the Channel four times, and travelled twelve hundred miles in very bad weather in a fortnight, I brought my friend back to his country and his family. His

appearance in the House of Commons instantly quashed all the injurious reports, which, from his hasty manner of leaving the country, scandal had raised to his disadvantage. He was a thorough honest man, and one of the friends I ever loved with the greatest affection. His temper was warm, and his wife (a very deserving woman) had been over-persuaded to marry him,—had she loved him as he loved her, she would have borne with his infirmity of temper. Great are the public evils, and little the private comforts attending interested marriages; when they become general, they not only portend but bring on a nation's ruin.

In October, 1764, I was made Moderator for Christ's College. On the 19th of the following November, on the death of Dr. Hadley, I was unanimously elected by the Senate, assembled in full congregation, Professor of Chemistry. An eminent physician in London had expressed a wish to succeed Dr. Hadley, but on my signifying to him that it was my intention to

read chemical lectures in the University, he declined the contest. At the time this honour was conferred upon me, I knew nothing at all of Chemistry, had never read a syllable on the subject; nor seen a single experiment in it; but I was tired with mathematics and natural philosophy, and the *vehementissima gloriæ cupido* stimulated me to try my strength in a new pursuit, and the kindness of the University (it was always kind to me) animated me to very extraordinary exertions. I sent immediately after my election to Paris for an operator; I buried myself as it were in my laboratory, at least as much as my other avocations would permit; and in fourteen months from my election, I read a course of chemical lectures to a very full audience, consisting of persons of all ages and degrees, in the University. I read another course in November, 1766, and was made Moderator, for the fourth time, in October, 1765.

In January every year, when the Bachelors of Arts take their degrees, one of the two Moderators makes a sort of speech in

Latin to the Senate; I made this speech three times: the last was in 1766. I had, in a former speech, taken the liberty to mention, with great freedom, some defects in the University education, especially with respect to Noblemen and Fellow-Commoners: and, without hinting the abolition of the orders, strongly insisted on the propriety of obliging them to keep exercises in the schools, as the other candidates for degrees did. In this last speech I recommended the instituting public annual examinations, in prescribed books, of all the orders of students in the University. I mentioned also the necessity of allowing more time for the examination, and of appointing more examiners, and of particularly distinguishing, by separate honours, the best proficients in the several branches of science; that those who could not excel in the abstract sciences, or natural philosophy, might have some chance for distinction in ethics and metaphysics.

In the year 1774, the subject of annual examinations of all the students was brought

forward by a very honest and intelligent, but unpopular man, Mr. Jebb, who had been Moderator with me some years before. A Syndicate (Committee) was appointed by the Senate to draw up a system of regulations for the introduction of annual examinations. The Duke of Grafton, as Chancellor of the University, was consulted, and gave an unequivocal approbation of the design. The Syndicate met several times at the Vice-Chancellor's, where the subject was discussed with great diligence and good temper. In a few weeks, the regulations which had been drawn up by the Syndics, were proposed to the Senate, and were rejected by the *Non Regent House*, 47 against 43. From what I personally knew of the tempers of the principal opposers of the measure, I had the greatest reason to suspect, that they were actuated by littlenesses of mind, respecting their dislike of any thing brought forward by Mr. Jebb, respecting their not having been previously consulted, not having been included in the Syndicate, &c., more than by any solid

ground of disapprobation to the measure itself. An account of the regulations, and of the principal persons who supported them, may be seen in Dr. Jebb's works, and in the Gentleman's Magazine for 1774.

There was no stipend annexed to the Professorship of Chemistry, nor any thing furnished to the Professor by the University, except a room to read lectures in. I was told that the Professors of Chemistry in Paris, Vienna, Berlin, Stockholm, &c., were supported by their respective monarchs; and I knew that the reading a course of lectures would every year be attended with a great expense; and being very hearty in the design of recommending chemistry to the attention of the youth of the University and of the country, I thought myself justified in applying to the minister for a stipend from the Crown. Lord Rockingham was then Minister (1766), and Mr. Luther, who had lately spent above twenty thousand pounds in establishing the Whig interest in Essex, undertook to ask for it. Though an hundred a

year, given for the encouragement of science, is but as a drop in the ocean, when compared with the enormous sums lavished in unmerited pensions, lucrative sinecure places, and scandalous jobs, by every Minister, on his flatterers and dependants, in order to secure his majorities in Parliament, yet I obtained this drop with difficulty; and, unless the voice of a member of Parliament had seconded my petition, I doubt whether I should have succeeded. I sent up to the Duke of Newcastle, Chancellor of the University, a testimonial from the Vice-Chancellor, that I had read with credit a course of chemical lectures; and that a chemical establishment would be highly useful to the University; together with this testimonial, I sent my petition to Lord Rockingham, requesting the Duke to present it to him.

The petition was presented in March, but I heard nothing about it till the July following; when, waiting upon the Duke of Newcastle, he asked if my business was done? I answered, *No*, and that I thought

it never would be done. I own I had been so much vexed at the delay, that I was very indifferent whether it ever was done or not, and therefore answered with more firmness than the old man had been used to. He then asked why it had not been done. My answer was, "Because Lord Rockingham says Your Grace ought to speak to the King, as Chancellor of the University; and Your Grace says, that Lord Rockingham ought to speak to the King, as Minister." He stared at me with astonishment; and, calling for paper, he instantly wrote a letter, and sealing it with his own seal, ordered me to go with it immediately to Lord Rockingham, who had a levee that day. I did so, (and it was the only time in my life that I ever attended a minister's levee,) and sent in my letter, before the levee began. I understood it was whispered, that Lord Rockingham and the Whigs were to go out of administration; and it was so: for their dismission was settled that day. Lord Rockingham, however, undertook to ask the King; and, apologizing for not having

done it sooner, offered in a very polite manner to have the stipend (I asked only for 100*l.* a year,) settled upon me for life. This I refused, and desired to have it only whilst I continued Professor of Chemistry, and discharged the duty of the office.

The ice being thus broken by me, similar stipends have been since procured from the Crown, for the Professors of Anatomy and Botany, and for the recently established Professor of Common Law. The University is now much richer than it was in 1766; and it would become its dignity, I think, to thank the King for his indulgence, and to pay in future its unendowed Professors without having recourse to the public purse; not that I feel the least reluctance to dipping into the public purse for such a purpose, but I feel something for the independence of the University.

In October, 1767, I became one of the Head Tutors in Trinity College, in the room of Mr. Backhouse, who resigned his pupils to me. I thought this an high trust,

and was conscientiously diligent in the discharge of it, during the short time I held this important office.

In this, and the two following years, I read Chemical Lectures to very crowded audiences, in the month of November. I now look back with a kind of terror at the application I used in the younger part of my life. For months and years together I frequently read three public lectures in Trinity College, beginning at eight o'clock in the morning; spent four or five hours with private pupils, and five or six more in my laboratory, every day, besides the incidental business of presiding in the Sophs' schools. Had so much pains and time been dedicated to Greek and Hebrew, and to what are called learned subjects, what tiresome collations of manuscripts, what argute emendations of text, what jejune criticisms, what dull dissertations, what ponderous logomachies might have been produced, and left to sleep on the same shelves with bulky systems of German divinity in the libraries of Universities!!!

In 1768, I composed and printed my *Institutiones Metallurgicæ,* and designed to have given a scientific form to chemistry, by digesting into a connected series of propositions, (after the manner of Rutherforth's Propositions, a book then held deservedly in high estimation in the University, though now scarcely heard of,) what was then certainly established by experiment in every branch of it.

Much about the same time, I sent a paper to the Royal Society, respecting various phenomena attending the solutions of salts, and was unanimously elected a Fellow of that illustrious body.

In 1769, I preached an Assize Sermon at Cambridge, and was desired by the Judge to publish it. This being the first of my publications, (for my Metallurgic Institutes were not published,) I dedicated it to the only person to whom I owed any obligation, Mr. Luther. I made it a rule never to dedicate to those from whom I expected favours, but to those only from whom I

had received them. The dedication of my Collection of Theological Tracts to the Queen did not come under either of these descriptions; it proceeded from the opinion I then entertained of her merit, as a wife and a mother. At the time this sermon was preached, government was greatly relaxed; and mobs, which I ever detested, thinking senseless popularity beneath the notice of genuine Whiggism, were very rife in favour of Mr. Wilkes. But though I disliked Mr. Wilkes's mobs, I did not dislike his cause, judging that the constitution was violated in the treatment he received both from the King's ministers, and the House of Commons. His case not only made a great noise at home, but was much bruited abroad; in cloisters, as well as in courts; amongst monks, as well as politicians. I happened to be at Paris about that time; and the only question which I was asked by a Carthusian monk, who shewed me his monastery, was, whether Monsieur *Vilkes*, or the King, had got the better.

In October, 1771, when I was preparing for another course of chemistry, and printing a new chemical syllabus, Dr. Rutherforth, Regius Professor of Divinity, died. This Professorship, as being one of the most arduous and honourable offices in the University, had long been the secret object of my ambition; I had for years determined in my own mind to endeavour to succeed Dr. Rutherforth, provided he lived till I was of a proper age, and fully qualified for the undertaking. His premature and unexpected death quite disheartened me. I knew as much of divinity as could reasonably be expected from a man whose course of studies had been directed to, and whose time had been fully occupied in, other pursuits; but with this *curta supellex* in theology to take possession of the first professional chair in Europe, seemed too daring an attempt even for my intrepidity.

However, not being of a temper to be discouraged by difficulties, and not observing that any men of distinguished talents

stood forth as candidates for the professorship, except Dr. Gordon, and thinking that I would labour night and day till I was qualified for the office, if I were appointed to it, and knowing that I was sufficiently versed in dialectics, from having presided many years in the philosophical schools, I determined to sound the University, and if I found the general sense of the body favourable to my pretensions, to become a candidate. I soon was informed from many different quarters, that the University expected I should come forward; so far was it from being displeased at what I myself considered as a bold proceeding. Even Dr. Powell, (who was not very partial to me from my having carried an appeal against his College) on my apologizing to him for offering myself as a candidate at so early an age, said, "that it would indeed have been great presumption in any other person of my age in the University, but that it was none in me." Before I publickly declared my intention of becoming a candidate, I waited upon Dr. Ogden, with whom I was well acquainted, and whom I

considered as the fittest person in the University to succeed to the vacant office, and pressed him to come forward, assuring him that if he would do so, he should not have me for a competitor; he gave me no decisive answer at that time, but on the morning of the day before that appointed for the examination of the candidates, I received from him the following note:

"After so much civility, and even kind-
"ness on the side of Dr. Watson, and so
"much delay on mine, I am both sorry
"and ashamed not to send him yet a deci-
"sive answer. It is not that I conceal my
"resolution from him, but that I have not
"taken any. I intend to send him ano-
"ther note either to night or to-morrow-
"morning, and hope, but dare not say, that
"I shall be more explicit.

"S. O."

I returned by the messenger the annexed answer:

"Mr. Watson can only repeat his wishes

" to see the Divinity-chair filled by Dr. " Ogden, and begs that he would in every " thing consult his own interest and incli- " nation. Mr. Watson will thank Dr. Og- " den, if he comes to any resolution, for " the favour of a note, for he does not " mean to present himself to the electors " to-morrow if Dr. Ogden is a candidate."

About ten o'clock in the evening of the same day I received from him the following very characteristic note :—

" I have behaved to you like a scoundrel " by my indecision, but I will not appear " in the schools to-morrow."

I afterwards was informed that Dr. Ogden hoped the electors would have *offered* him the professorship, and that he waited to the last moment in expectation of their doing so. This transaction occasioned no coolness between him and me, for I had a great regard for him ; and when I sent him, a week or two after, the chemical syllabus which I was then printing, he favoured me

with another of his pithy laconisms: *Provinciam quam nactus es, sic orna.*

I was not, when Dr. Rutherforth died, either Bachelor or Doctor in Divinity, and without being one of them I could not become a candidate for the professorship. This puzzled me for a moment; I had only seven days to transact the business in; but by hard travelling and some adroitness I accomplished my purpose, obtained the King's mandate for a Doctor's degree, and was created a Doctor on the day previous to that appointed for the examination of the candidates. On that day I appeared before the electors assembled in the law-schools, and had two subjects given to write upon. The reconciliation of the genealogies in Matthew and Luke, and the interpretation of the passage, "What shall they do which are baptized for the dead?" 1 Cor. xv. 29.

Dr. Gordon also appeared, made some objection to the formality of the proceedings, and on that account refused being

examined. I delivered to the electors, at three o'clock on the same day, what I had written in Latin on the two subjects. They then appointed me another subject:—"These are the families of the sons of "Noah, after their generations, in their na-"tions: and by these were the nations "divided in the earth after the flood," Gen. x. 32; on which I was to read a Latin dissertation of an hour in length, in the divinity-schools, on that day fortnight.

I read my dissertation at the appointed time and place, and was unanimously elected the day following. On the 14th of the ensuing November I took the chair, made a long inauguration speech, and presided at my first act in the presence of a numerous audience.

Thus did I, by hard and incessant labour for seventeen years, attain, at the age of thirty-four, the first office for honour in the University; and, exclusive of the Mastership of Trinity College, I have made it the first for profit. I found the Professorship

not worth quite 330*l.* a year, and it is now worth 1000*l.* at the least.

On being raised to this distinguished office, I immediately applied myself with great eagerness to the study of divinity. Eagerness, indeed, in the pursuit of knowledge was a part of my temper, till the acquisition of knowledge was attended with nothing but the neglect of the King and his ministers; and I feel by a broken constitution at this hour, the effects of that literary diligence with which I laboured for a great many years.

I reduced the study of divinity into as narrow a compass as I could, for I determined to study nothing but my Bible, being much unconcerned about the opinions of councils, fathers, churches, bishops, and other men, as little inspired as myself. This mode of proceeding being opposite to the general one, and especially to that of the Master of Peterhouse, who was a great reader, he used to call me αυτοδιδακτος, the self-taught divine.—The Professor of Divi-

The good Bishop appears to have thought more of the worlds profits & consequences of his attainments than of higher gain —

nity had been nick-named *Malleus Hæreticorum;* it was thought to be his duty to demolish every opinion which militated against what is called the orthodoxy of the Church of England. Now my mind was wholly unbiassed; I had no prejudice against, no predilection for the Church of England; but a sincere regard for the *Church of Christ,* and an insuperable objection to every degree of dogmatical intolerance. I never troubled myself with answering any arguments which the opponents in the divinity-schools brought against the articles of the church, nor ever admitted their authority as decisive of a difficulty; but I used on such occasions to say to them, holding the New Testament in my hand, *En sacrum codicem!* Here is the fountain of truth, why do you follow the streams derived from it by the sophistry, or polluted by the passions of man? If you can bring proofs against any thing delivered in this book, I shall think it my duty to reply to you; articles of churches are not of divine authority; have done with them; for they may be true, they

may be false; and appeal to the book itself. This mode of disputing gained me no credit with the hierarchy, but I thought it an honest one, and it produced a liberal spirit in the University.—In the course of this year (1771) I had printed an essay on the subject of chemistry, and given it to a few of my friends; by some means or other it fell into the hands of the authors of the *Journal Encyclopédique*; who, in giving an account of it, said, that I had followed the author of the *Système de la Nature*. I wrote but indifferent French; I ventured, however, to send them the following letter:—

"Messieurs,

"Je suis très flatté par la critique que vous avez faite sur mon Essai de Chymie. Il auroit été suivi de plusieurs autres plus intéressans peut-être, et plus dignes de votre attention, si mon élévation à la Chaire Théologique n'avoit pas interrompue mes spéculations sur la Chymie et la Physique. Mais permettez, je vous en prie, à ce petit enfant d'appartenir à moi seul, comme à son père. Je l'estimerois indigne de mes

soins, et je l'abandonnerois sans regret, s'il n'étoit, vraisemblablement, le dernier gage de mon amour pour la Physique qui verra la lumière. Sur l'honneur d'un amateur des sciences, je n'ai jamais lu ni vu le *Système de la Nature,* ni quelque autre livre sur le sujet de mon essai.

"J'ai l'honneur d'être, &c.

"R. WATSON."

In a following journal this letter was published, and an apology was made for the mistake they had fallen into in their criticism. Before I ventured to publish this piece, I submitted it for his advice to the perusal of my friend Dr. Law, and he returned it to me with this note: "Publish, *Meo Periculo* φωναντα συνετοισιν."

In 1772, I published two short letters to the Members of the House of Commons, under the feigned name of a Christian Whig, and put myself to the expense of giving a copy of the first to every Member of the House, the day before the clerical petition was taken into their consideration.

I was then, and at all times, a great admirer of the integrity and ability of Sir George Saville; and without acquainting him with my purpose, I took the liberty of inscribing to him the second letter, in the following terms:—"A stranger to the person of Sir George Saville, inscribes this tract to his character." In 1773, upon maturely weighing the question concerning the abstract right which a national church may claim of requiring subscription to human articles of faith from its public ministers, I published a small tract entitled, "A brief State of the Principles of Church Authority." When I visited my diocese in June, 1813, I read it verbatim to my clergy as my charge to them, and was requested by them to publish it, with the following preface:

"*A Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Llandaff.*

"Reverend Brethren,

"It is not unknown, I presume, to many amongst you, that I have been your Bishop for above thirty years; but it cannot be

known by any of you, that, nine years before I became Bishop of Llandaff, I published in London a short anonymous tract entitled, 'A brief State of the Principles of Church Authority.'

"A desire of settling my own opinions on some important points, was my sole motive for then making that publication; few of you, I believe, have ever met with it, and fewer probably of those who have formerly met with it, have ever perused it, and not one perhaps of those who may formerly have perused it, now recollects its contents. Under such circumstances, I do not deem it necessary to make any apology, for introducing it at present to your consideration. The subject of it demands the most dispassionate discussion at all times, and especially at this time, when such subjects are much agitated, and I trust always agitated with candour and liberality by both Churchmen and Dissenters of different denominations."

"*Appendix to the 'Brief State.'*—In this tract it is said that every church has a right

of explaining to its ministers what doctrines it holds, and of permitting none to minister in it who do not profess the same belief with itself. This conclusion has been thought by some, whose judgment I greatly esteem, to be erroneous, and I have been advised by them many years ago to reconsider the reasoning from which it is deduced. I have reconsidered the whole pamphlet, and must own that I cannot perceive any false reasoning in any part of it. I am sensible, however, that the mind of man, when it has once come to a conclusion on any subject, is apt, in every subsequent examination of it, to give too much weight to the arguments by which the conclusion is established, and too little to those by which it is opposed; and I am far from being confident that my mind, in reviewing this subject, is free from the general infirmity. I may still be in an error; and if I am, I earnestly request you, my Reverend Brethren, to believe that it is an error perfectly involuntary: I have not been betrayed into it, from a design or a desire of saying any thing in support of

the Established Church, beyond or beside what I thought true with respect to every other *voluntary* assembly of Christians associated for divine worship. Whether the majority of the members of any civil community have a right to compel all the members of it to *pay* towards the maintenance of a set of teachers, appointed by the majority to preach a particular system of doctrines, is a question which might admit a serious discussion. I was once of opinion, that the majority had this right in *all* cases, and I am still of opinion that they have it in *many*. But I am staggered when I consider that a case may happen, in which the established religion may be the religion of a minority of the people; that minority, at the same time, possessing a majority of the property, out of which the ministers of the establishment are to be paid."

My sentiments as to the *expediency* of requiring from the ministers of the Established Church a subscription to the present articles of religion, or to any human confession of faith, further than a declara-

tion of belief in the Scriptures, as containing a revelation of the will of God, may be collected from what I have said in the two pamphlets subscribed "A Christian Whig," and "A Consistent Protestant." These tracts were well received by the world; but detesting controversy, I never owned them. They were composed more from my own reflections on the subject, than from adverting to what others had said upon it. I have since had satisfaction in finding, that my thoughts on many points, both religious and civil, were in perfect coincidence with those of Bishop Hoadly; and I glory in this, notwithstanding the abuse that eminent prelate experienced in his own time, and notwithstanding he has been in our time sarcastically called, and what is worse, injuriously called by Bishop Horsley, a *republican bishop*.

My constitution was ill fitted for celibacy, and as soon, therefore, as I had any means of maintaining a family I married. My wife was the eldest daughter of Edward Wilson, Esq. of Dallam Tower, in

Westmoreland. We were married at Lancaster on the 21st of December, 1773. During a cohabitation of above forty years, she has been every thing I wished her to be; and I trust I have lived with her, and provided for her, as a man, not unconscious of her worth, ought to have done.

The day after my marriage I set forward to take possession of a sinecure rectory in North Wales, procured for me, from the Bishop of St. Asaph, by the Duke of Grafton, out of a kind consideration of my being ill provided for; as I had no preferment but the professorship of divinity. This sinecure, on my return to Cambridge, I exchanged for a prebend in the church of Ely; the exchange was wholly owing to the unsolicited attention of the Duke. At the time he did me this favour, we thought differently on politics. I had made no scruple of every where declaring, that I looked upon the American war as *unjust* in its commencement, and that its conclusion would be unfavourable to this kingdom, and his Grace did not abandon

the administration till October, 1775.—As I had then the good fortune to see a person, to whom I was so much obliged, come over to my opinion, I could not forbear giving a proof of my gratitude, by printing the following letter in the Public Advertiser, though the Duke never, I believe, knew that I wrote it.

"*To His Grace the Duke of Grafton.*

November 27, 1775.

"My Lord Duke,

"Your Grace owes not this letter to the prostituted pen of an hireling, nor to the forward zeal of a dependant, nor to the partial warmth of personal attachment; but to a love for truth and a reverence for justice. And who that has a regard for either, can hear without abhorrence Your Grace's separation from the ministry branded as an apostacy from honour, and the most illustrious action of your life stigmatized as a desertion of the interests of your country?—I mean not to become Your Grace's panegyrist, further than my conscience tells me you deserve praise. I

have no talent for adulation; it suits not my temper, and my situation sets me above the temptation of using it; but if the heart of *Junius* be not obstructed by private pique, if malignant habitudes have not rendered him callous to the honourable feelings of a man, he will blush with shame and remorse for having mistaken and traduced your character: he will embrace with eagerness this fair opportunity of retracting his abuse, and candidly portray Your Grace to the world in such striking colours of truth and honour, as may obliterate from the memory of every ingenuous man the base aspersions of his calumny. Your loyalty to the King has ever been above suspicion; your adherence to the liberties of the people has been represented by your enemies as precarious and problematical; but your breaking a bond of union with those, whom personal regards and the intercourse of social life had rendered dear to you, your voluntarily incurring the displeasure of a Sovereign whom you loved, your resigning an honourable and lucrative post so soon as you were persuaded that

the measures of administration tended to the oppression of the people and the ruin of the empire, — these sacrifices of interest and affection (the greatest surely a man can make) to conscience, will ever be remembered, by impartial men, to your credit; and cannot fail to exalt your character as a man of integrity, as a supporter of the indefeasible rights of mankind, far beyond the temporary reach of ministerial invective or personal malevolence.

"Lord Effingham stands deservedly high in the estimation of the public, and Your Grace's conduct is not less eminently great.

"Party may say that you are mistaken, but it cannot say that you are not honest. Such instances of disinterested patriotism are uncommon in any history, and would have done credit to the early periods of Roman history. — In these *times, and in this nation; when an attention to the public good is apt to be considered by wise men as folly; when individuals in every class of life, I had almost said in every department of the state, are more ashamed of poverty than of dishonour,*

and when luxury makes almost every individual poor; they demand the hearty approbation of every lover of his country.

"I am, &c."

Such were my sentiments of the defect of public principle, and of the progress of general luxury in 1775; and in 1813 they are not altered. At the time I published this letter, I knew very little of the Duke of Grafton, as an acquaintance; I had afterwards more intimacy with him, and I was for many years, indeed as long as he lived, happy in his friendship. It appears from some hundreds of my letters, which he had ordered at his death to be returned unread to me, that we had not always agreed either in our political or religious opinions; but we had both of us too much sense to suffer a diversity of sentiment to deaden the activity of personal attachment. I never attempted either to encourage or to discourage his profession of *Unitarian* principles; for I was happy to see a person of his rank, professing with intelligence and with sincerity Christian principles. If any one

thinks that an Unitarian is not a Christian, I plainly say, without being myself an Unitarian, that I think otherwise.

I never printed any thing else in a newspaper, except a letter in defence of the Bishop of Peterborough, who had followed the Duke of Grafton in quitting the ministry; and the subsequent one in support of what I conceived to have been neglected by our Chancellor, when he recommended to us for one of our members of Parliament an obscure country-gentleman:—

"My Lord Duke,

"LEARNED bodies have ever been studious of acquiring the protection of men, distinguished either by eminency of rank or excellency of talents. Your Grace became our Chancellor from the united influence of these motives. We were happy in thinking that we had attached to our interest a nobleman, whose high birth would add honour to his abilities, and whose abilities, upon any emergency, would explain

to the House of Lords our ancient principles, or solicit for us such new indulgences from the legislature, as the change of times might render suitable to the particularities of our situation, and conducive to the good of the public.

"We doubt not Your Grace's disposition to exert yourself in our favour, when an occasion offers; but we are sorry that in the recommendation of a candidate to succeed Mr. De Grey, as our representative in Parliament, Your Grace had forgotten, as it were, both the dignity of your own character and the respect due to ours. We received your recommendation of Mr. De Grey without reluctance; we knew him to be a man of merit, and, upon that account, were cordially disposed to give him every mark of our respect, and to confide in his ability to serve us. But we are dissatisfied with the gentleman designed for his successor: we have no particular objections to him as a private man; nay, we believe him equal to the transacting the business of the Borough of *Downton*, but we by no means

think him of consequence enough in life to be the representative, or of ability sufficient to support the interest, of the *University* of *Cambridge*. Your Grace has added lustre to our University, by giving us two resident Bishops. You have rendered services to some other individuals; they are men of integrity; doubtless you will receive from them the tribute of private gratitude. As a body we thank you for this attention to individuals; but we call upon you also for an attention to our general good, which, in the present instance, we think you have much neglected. In one word, My Lord, you must not consider us as a *venal borough*. You have secured to yourself the heads of some colleges: they have, in their respective societies, some little influence; but I plainly tell Your Grace, that there is a large body of independent members of the Senate who are well affected to Your Grace's interest, but who cannot be brought to give it an indiscriminate support.

"I am, &c."

I had taken singular pains in the education of Lord Granby, both before my marriage and after it; I was therefore highly gratified in receiving from him a letter, at Lancaster, dated the 17th of August, 1775, in which was the following paragraph:—

"If the Whigs will not now unite themselves in opposition to such a Tory principle, which has established the present unconstitutional system, this country will be plunged into perdition beyond redemption. I never can thank you too much for making me study Locke; while I exist, those tenets, which are so attentive to the natural rights of mankind, shall ever be the guide and direction of my actions.—I live at Cheveley; I hope often to see you; you may, and I am sure you will, still assist me in my studies. Though I have formed a Tory connexion, Whig principles are too firmly rivetted in me ever to be removed. Best compliments to Mrs. Watson, and reserve to yourself the assurance of my

"being most affectionately and sincerely "yours,

"GRANBY."

Answer.

Trumpington, August 15th, 1775.

"My Dear Lord.

"I GOT home the day before yesterday, and employ my first leisure in answering your letter, which I received at Lancaster. Nothing can give me greater pleasure than the finding you so well satisfied with the part I have taken in your education; and that you may, some time or other, become a great and an honest minister is the warm wish of my heart.

"As to your studies, you may ever command my best assistance in the furtherance of them; you certainly ought not to think yourself at liberty to lay them aside at your age; books, indeed, never made a great statesman, and business has made many; yet books and business, combined together, are the most likely to enlarge

your understanding, and to complete the character you aim at.

"Persevere, I beg of you, in the resolution of doing something for yourself; your ancestors have left you rank and fortune; these will procure you that respect from the world, which other men with difficulty obtain, by personal merit. But if to these you add your own endeavours to become good, and wise, and great, then will you deserve the approbation of men of sense.

"General reading is the most useful for men of the world, but few men of the world have leisure for it; and those who have courage to abridge their pleasures, for the improvement of their minds, would do well to consider that different books ought to be read with very different degrees of attention; or, as Lord Bacon quaintly enough expresses it, some books are to be tasted or read in part only; some to be swallowed or read wholly, but not cursorily; and some to be digested, or read with great diligence, and well considered. Of this last kind are the works of Lord Bacon himself. Nature has been very sparing in

the production of such men as Bacon; they are a kind of superior beings; and the rest of mankind are usefully employed for whole centuries in picking up what they poured forth at once. Lord Bacon opened the avenues of all science, and had such a comprehensive way of thinking upon every subject, that a familiarity with his writings cannot fail of being extensively useful to you as an orator; and there are so many shrewd observations concerning human nature dispersed through his works, that you will be much the wiser for them as a private man.

"I would observe the same of Mr. Locke's writings, all of which, without exception (even his letters to the Bishop of Worcester will teach you acuteness in detecting sophistry in debate), may be read over and over again with infinite advantage. His reasoning is every where profound, and his language masculine. I hate the flimsy womanish eloquence of novel readers, I mean of such as read nothing else, and wish you, therefore, to acquire both justness of sentiment and strength of

expression, from the perusal of the works of great men. Make Bacon, then, and Locke, and why should I not add that sweet child of nature, Shakspeare, your chief companions through life; let them be ever upon your table; and when you have an hour to spare from business or pleasure, spend it with them, and I will answer for their giving you entertainment and instruction as long as you live.

"You can no more have an intimacy with all books than with all men, and one should take the best of both kinds for one's peculiar friends; for the human mind is ductile to a degree, and insensibly conforms itself to what it is most accustomed to. Thus with books as with men, a few friends stand us in better stead than a multitude of folks we know little of. I do not think that you will ever become a great reader, I hope your time will be better employed; and yet, considering the worthless way in which the generality of men of fashion weary out their existence, the odds are against my hopes; yet I do hope it, and therefore will not burden you with the re-

commendation of a learned catalogue of ancient authors. One of them, however, I must mention to you; all the works of Plutarch are excellent, whether read in the original or in a good translation, and his Lives in particular will furnish you not only with the knowledge of the greatest characters in antiquity, but will give you no mean insight into the most interesting parts of the Greek and Roman histories. Eloquence was never learned by rule, and Tully, and Quinctilian, and Longinus themselves could not have made a Chatham; but a frequent reading of the best compositions, ancient and modern, will be of service to you.

"Locke has laid in you a good foundation, or rather has finished the work of civil government, so that other authors upon that subject are less necessary for you; from him you are become acquainted with some of the principal questions of natural Law; however, I think it would be very serviceable for you, and tend greatly to the furnishing your mind with a species of knowledge which you will have frequent

occasion for, though you may not at present, perhaps, be aware of the want of it, if you would take the trouble to peruse with attention some good author upon the Laws of Nature. Among the great number who have treated that subject with success, I am of opinion that Rutherforth's Institutes (a kind of commentary upon Grotius *De Jure Belli et Pacis*), will, upon the whole, be the best book for you to employ your time upon. I am no stranger to what is urged in favour of Puffendorf, Cumberland, Hutchinson, Burlamaqui, and other more modern productions; but trust me for once, and you will not have any reason, I hope, to think your confidence in this matter misplaced. I take it for granted that one author will be as much as you will have patience for, upon that subject; and, indeed, I think one will be as much as you will have occasion for. From the knowledge I have of the course of your former studies, and the apprehension of what, from your present situation as a young nobleman just entering into life, you will have the most immediate concern for,

I should wish you to begin with Rutherforth immediately; and when you have read him leisurely and carefully quite through, as soon as you have finished him, and not before, if you would read Blackstone's Commentaries with an equal degree of attention, I should think you very well grounded; and depend upon it no superstructure can be raised where there is no foundation. *Sapere* is as truly the *principium et fons* of good speaking as of good writing. I will not trouble you with any thing more upon this subject at present, for the books I have mentioned to you will require more time than you will be able shortly to give them. I have had no regard in what I have written to a fine plan, which it is much easier for me to form than for any one to execute, but barely to what I think will be most useful to you at present, and most conducive to the one great end of your becoming a distinguished character in the management of national affairs, at some more distant period of your life. Different books may be proper for you as you increase in knowledge, and the best mo-

dern publications will fall in your way of course. As to mathematics and natural philosophy, though much of my own time has been spent in the cultivation of them, I do not think that they ought to be a principal pursuit with you. Euclid would have done much towards fixing your attention; but Locke has well supplied his place, and I will, at any time when you have leisure and inclination for such an undertaking, make you acquainted with any one or with all the branches of natural philosophy. Not that you will have much time upon your hands soon, for marriage enlarges the sphere of a man's engagements, and a woman who has sense and goodness enough to relish domestic pleasures (and few other pleasures are either satisfactory or durable, to say no worse of them), has a right to break in upon a man's hours of study, and to every attention in his power to shew her.

"I heartily wish you well in the new mode of life you are entering into; much depends upon your setting out properly; be a Whig in domestic as well as political

life, and the best part of Whiggism is, that it will neither suffer nor exact domination.

"Adieu, my dear Lord Granby! I felt myself concerned in your happiness and success in life, and in this concern your rank in civil society has no share. It is the man I look at, and the connexion I have had with him, which makes me wish you well, and bids me assure you that you may command every act of friendship in my power.

"Yours most truly,

"RICHARD WATSON."

In November, 1775, the University of Cambridge, following the example of Oxford, thought fit to address the King, exhorting him to the continuance of the American war. The address was proposed to the Senate by Dr. Farmer, the most determined of Tories. On that occasion I received the following letter from the Marquis of Rockingham, which I am induced to leave behind me, not only as one proof amongst a thousand of his true patriotism and good sense, but because I conceive it

to be an honour to myself to have been well thought of by him.

" Dear Sir,

" ALLOW me to express the very real pleasure and satisfaction which I felt at receiving your letter on Monday night; I had heard several days ago that there was an intention to try to procure an address from the University of Cambridge, and though my information was not very clear and decisive, yet I thought it sufficiently well founded to communicate it to the Duke of Grafton and Lord Granby. They at that time doubted the probability of the attempt, but in the middle of the last week I again received, from the Duke of Manchester, so much more confirmation, that I immediately got it again communicated to the Duke of Grafton and Lord Granby. I imagine the Bishop of Peterborough's going to Cambridge at the time he did might be occasioned by it.

" Lord Granby, as member for the University, feels a doubt on the propriety of his being active in this business; and yet

I confess I wished much, from the first, that not only the Duke of Grafton and Lord Granby, but that also the friends of Whig principles would bestir themselves to prevent what I really think will be a great disgrace to the University. I am still not without hopes that the address will be stopped; I have much reliance, that although Whig principles may lie as it were dormant, yet the occasion will bring them out; and I think the Whig University of Cambridge being called upon to play the second fiddle to the Tory University of Oxford, will even alarm that sort of pride, which is sometimes not an useless guardian to virtue. Lord Richard Cavendish was with me late last night; I find there are a few who would incline to set out on the shortest notice.

" Mr. Thomas Townsend was with me this morning, and I saw Mr. Montague yesterday. I find both of them hesitate on the propriety of a few considerable persons going down, as it were by surprise, to prevent what may be the sense of the resident persons in the University.

" I will try to see Sir G. Saville to-morrow morning; I saw him yesterday on various matters, and totally omitted asking his opinion in respect to this affair at Cambridge. I enclose you a list, as Lord Richard Cavendish and I made it out; you will see we know of but few who are in London, and those few are chiefly persons in the University.

" It is no small satisfaction to me to find, that the only two persons with whom I have the honour to have any intercourse at Cambridge, namely, yourself and Dr. Ellison, are always to be found acting on those principles whereon our first acquaintance was grounded. No event, I trust, can ever operate on any of us to shake that cement. I hope you will receive this letter early in the morning, and that I may have an answer from you before four o'clock in the evening; that in case, upon full consideration, you think that even a few should set out, I may get it communicated to them early in the morning. I imagine the business cannot come on till Friday, at the soonest.

"I am, dear Sir, with very great truth and regard, Your most obedient servant, and sincere friend,

"ROCKINGHAM.

"Grosvenor-Square, Wednesday night, past 12 o'clock, Nov. 22, 1775."

Answer.

"Trumpington, Nov. 25, 1775.

"My Lord,

"I DID not get out of the Senate house soon enough for the post on Friday last. The Tories beat us by eight votes in the Whitehood house; they owe their victory to the ministerial troops, which were poured in from the Admiralty, Treasury, &c. beyond expectation. I am quite sorry for this event, not only as it is derogatory to our former character, but as the sense of the two Universities, thus publicly declared, may have an undue weight with many individuals; for the bulk of mankind is ever more the creature of prejudice than of reason.

"Surely the clergy have a professional

bias to support the powers that are, be they what they may. But I will not say all I think on this subject; especially as this bias, if it exists, may proceed as much from the moderation and forbearance inculcated by the general tendency of their studies, as from the more obvious imputation of interested motives. As I seldom come to London, I have no opportunity of paying my respects to your Lordship, and soliciting the honour of a nearer acquaintance; but I am not on that account less attached to one, whom I have ever considered as the head of the Whig interest in this kingdom; and let the pensioners and place-men say what they will, *Whig* and *Tory* are as opposite to each other, as Mr. *Locke* and Sir *Robert Filmer;* as the soundest sense, and the profoundest nonsense; and I must always conclude, that a man has lost his honesty, or his intellect, when he attempts to confound the ideas.

"Lord Richard Cavendish left me yesterday; he bids me hope for an accession of strength to the minority after Christmas. Would to God, it may tend to

effectuate a change of men and measures, before we have blundered on beyond a possibility of rectifying our mistake!

"*It is an infatuation in the minister, next to a crime, to suppose that the House of Bourbon, however quiescent and indifferent it may appear at present, will not avail itself of our dissensions in every possible way, and to every possible extent; and the moment America is compelled to open her ports, and to refuge her distress under foreign protection, there will be an end of our history as a great people.*

"I am, &c.

"Richard Watson."

How fully this prediction respecting the conduct of the House of Bourbon, was verified by the event, every one knows; and our children will know, whether the other part of it was a groundless prediction.

In 1776, it came to my turn to preach the Restoration and Accession Sermons before the University: I published them both, calling the first, "*The Principles of the Revolution Vindicated.*"

This Sermon was written with great caution, and at the same time, with great boldness and respect for truth. In London it was reported, at its first coming out, to be treasonable; and a friend of mine, Mr. Wilson, (the late Judge,) who was anxious for my safety, asked Mr. Dunning (afterwards Lord Ashburton,) what he thought of it; who told him, "that it contained just such treason as ought to be preached once a month at St. James's." It gave great offence to the Court; and was at the time, and has continued to be, an obstacle to my promotion.

I knew nothing of either Lord George Germaine, or the Archbishop of Armagh; but Mr. Cumberland, Lord George's secretary, told Mr. Higgs, one of the Fellows of Trinity College, with a view of what he said being repeated to me, that these two personages had intended to propose me to the King, for the Provostship of Dublin University. I asked what had made them abandon their intention? It was answered, your Sermon on the Principles of the Re-

volution. I hastily replied, Bid Mr. Cumberland inform his principal, that I will neither ask or accept preferment from Lord George Germaine, or from any other person to whom these principles have rendered me obnoxious. The loss of so great a piece of preferment would have broken the spirit of many an academic; and the desire of regaining lost favour would have made him a suppliant to the Court for life. It had no such effect on me. The firmness of this reply was too much for Mr. Cumberland's political virtue; for he afterwards, in two sorry pamphlets, showed himself mine enemy. I call them sorry pamphlets; because, though there was some humour, there was no argument in them.

On the first publication of this Sermon, I was much abused by ministerial writers, as a man of republican principles. I did not deign to give any answer to the calumny, except by printing on a blank page, in subsequent editions of it, the following interpretation of the terms, from Bishop Hoadly's Works:—" Men of Re-

publican principles—a sort of dangerous Men, who have of late taken heart, and defended the Revolution that saved us."

Mr. Fox, in debating the Sedition Bill, in December, 1795, said, "that the measures of the united branches of the legislature might be so bad, as to justify the people in resisting the government. This doctrine he had been taught, not only by *Sydney* and *Locke*, but by *Sir G. Saville*, and the late Earl of Chatham; and if these authorities would not suffice, he would refer the House to a Sermon preached by Dr. Watson, the present Bishop of Landaff, which, in his opinion, was replete with manly sense and accurate reasoning, upon that delicate but important subject."

I had always looked upon Mr. Fox to be one of the most constitutional reasoners, and one of the most argumentative orators in either House of Parliament. I was, at the time this compliment was paid me, and am still, much gratified by it. The appro-

bation of such men ever has been, and ever will be, dearer to me than the most dignified and lucrative stations in the church.

In the summer of 1776, I published my *Apology for Christianity*. I was induced to look into Mr. Gibbon's History, by a friend, (Sir Robert Graham,) who told me, that the attack upon Christianity, contained in two of his chapters, could not be repelled. My answer had a great run, and is still sought after, though it was only a month's work in the long vacation. But if I had been longer about it, though I might have stuffed it with more learning, and made it more bulky, I am not certain that I should have made it better. The manner in which I had treated Mr. Gibbon displeased some of the doughty polemics of the time; they were angry with me for not having bespattered him with a portion of that theological dirt, which Warburton had so liberally thrown at his antagonists. One of that gentleman's greatest admirers, (Bishop Hurd), was even so uncandid, as to entertain, from

the gentleness of my language, a suspicion of my sincerity; saying of the Apology, "it was well enough, if I was in earnest."

I sent a copy before it was published to Mr. Gibbon, from whom I received the following note.

"Mr. Gibbon takes the earliest opportunity of presenting his compliments and thanks to Dr. Watson; and of expressing his sense of the liberal treatment which he has received from so candid an adversary. Mr. Gibbon entirely coincides in opinion with Dr. Watson, that, as their different sentiments on a very important point of history are now submitted to the public, they both may employ their time in a manner much more useful, as well as agreeable, than they can possibly do by exhibiting a single combat in the amphitheatre of controversy. Mr. Gibbon is therefore determined to resist the temptation of justifying in a professed reply any passages of his history, which it might perhaps be easy to clear from censure and

misapprehension. But he still reserves to himself the privilege of inserting, in a future edition, some occasional remarks and explanations of his meaning. If any calls of pleasure or business should bring Dr. Watson to town, Mr. Gibbon would think himself fortunate in being permitted to solicit the honour of his acquaintance.

"Bentinck Street, Nov. 2d, 1776."

Answer to Mr. Gibbon's Note.

"Dr. Watson accepts with pleasure Mr. Gibbon's polite invitation to a personal acquaintance, and, if he comes to town this winter, will certainly have the honour of waiting upon him; begs at the same time to assure Mr. Gibbon, that he will be very happy to have an opportunity of shewing him every civility, if curiosity or other motives should bring him to Cambridge. Dr. Watson can have some faint idea of Mr. Gibbon's difficulty, in resisting the temptation he speaks of, from having of late been in a situation somewhat similar himself. It would be very extraordinary, if Mr. Gibbon did not feel a parent's par-

tiality, for an offspring which has justly excited the admiration of all who have seen it, and Dr. Watson would be the last person in the world, to wish him to conceal any explanation which might tend to exalt its beauties.

"Cambridge, Nov. 4th, 1776."

From a variety of complimentary letters I received on the first publication of the Apology for Christianity, I have selected the following; and that, not for the sake of the too flattering compliment it contains, but because I am desirous that my name should go down to posterity, as the friend of Dr. John Jebb.

"Dear Sir,

"THOUGH I have a great idea of my own insignificance, and am conscious that my approbation ought not to afford you any other satisfaction, than what may arise from the consideration of its being the approbation of an hearty friend, yet I cannot prevail with myself to be silent, after the

reading of your invaluable book. I am delighted with it beyond measure. Various parts suggest to me new lights, which have quieted my mind with respect to some difficulties which I never expected to have seen so completely removed. It will no doubt encrease your already high reputation, but it will do more; it will, I trust, remove the prejudices of many well disposed Deists, and be the happy mean of converting them to the truth. The liberal sentiments that every where prevail in it, do you the highest honour. I have heard of a bishop who declares himself highly pleased with your performance. My wife who has a veneration for you is also prodigiously satisfied; she is only a little alarmed lest you have found out a greater mathematician than her friend Waring. But, I will trouble you no more, except to mention that when you come to a second edition, I will, if you excuse the presumption, and approve, point out two or three places, which possibly you would apply your correcting hand to. The elegance,

simplicity, and accuracy of style, gives myself and all I converse with great pleasure. May every happiness attend you.

"I am, with great esteem,

"Your affectionate friend,

"JOHN JEBB."

Mr. Maseres, Cursitor Baron of the Exchequer, and well known to the world by his treatise on the negative sign, and other mathematical works, had examined me for my degree, and twenty years afterwards he did me the honour of recollecting that circumstance, and made me a present of his Canadian Freeholder. I returned him thanks in the following letter.

"Cambridge, Oct. 11, 1777.

"Sir,

"BEFORE I had read the third volume of your Dialogues, which you were so kind as to send me, I lent it to the Bishop of Carlisle, and he did not return it till last Thursday. I have now perused it with great care, and find your arguments on every point so singularly clear and concise,

that I heartily wish there was sense and virtue enough in the kingdom to consider them with attention. The two brochures, (The Christian Whig, and a Brief State of the Principles of Church Authority,) which accompany this, were published some years ago, without my name, and I mean not to own them at present, lest I should be involved in theological controversy, which generally ends in undue animosity; but you will perceive from them, that I am wedded to no system except that of universal toleration and christian good will. Your distinctions relative to the different degrees of toleration are undoubtedly just. The government of Connecticut and Massachusetts Bay have set an example, I had almost said of justice, in the disposal of the public wealth for the maintenance of the ministers of religion, well worthy the imitation of all Christian states; and their moderation ought to cover the sticklers amongst ourselves for American episcopacy, with contrition and confusion.

"By virtue of my office in the university, I am a minister of the Society for pro-

pagating the Gospel in foreign parts; but ever since my appointment to the Professorship of Divinity, I have resolutely refused contributing any thing towards the support of the society, because I always believed that its missionaries were more zealous in proselyting Dissenters to episcopacy, than in converting Heathens to Christianity. This conduct of mine has been considered as exceeding strange, and has given great offence; but I had rather offend all the dignitaries of the church for ever, than act contrary to my decided judgment for an hour, and your book will now inform them, that my reasons for not subscribing were well founded. Whenever I consider how much the Church of Christ has been polluted by the ambition of its ministers, how much the great ends of civil society have been perverted by a lust of domination in its rulers, it makes me regret the low condition of humanity, and excites a longing for some other existence where the petty passions incident to our nature will be done away; where truth,

and honesty, and charity, and all the virtues which either a philosopher or a Christian can set any value upon, shall be practised with less disadvantage.

"I am a man of no kind of ceremony, and shall be happy in cultivating your acquaintance whenever I have an opportunity. This short scene of life is too important to be wrangled away in endless disputes, on subjects of politics, or religion, with men who are ignorant of every useful object of knowledge, or with those whose judgments are warped by interest, or misguided by passion. I look upon the improvement of the understanding, by a free communication of sentiments with a candid and intelligent friend, as one of the greatest blessings on this side the grave.

"I am, &c.

"R. WATSON."

In the beginning of the year (1779), Mr. Gibbon published an answer to his various antagonists, who had animadverted on his History of the Decline and Fall of the Ro-

man Empire. This answer was distinguished by great severity towards other men, but by great courtesy towards myself. I thought myself called upon to write to Mr. Gibbon, and sent him the subjoined letter.

"Sir,

"It will give me the greatest pleasure to have an opportunity of becoming better acquainted with Mr. Gibbon; I beg he would accept my sincere thanks for the too favourable manner, in which he has spoken of a performance, which derives its chief merit from the elegance and importance of the work it attempts to oppose.

"*I have no hope of a future existence except that which is grounded on the truth of Christianity; I wish not to be deprived of this hope:* but I should be an apostate from the mild principles of the religion I profess, if I could be actuated with the least animosity against those who do not think with me, upon this, of all other the most important subject. I beg your pardon, for this declaration of my belief, but my temper is na-

turally open, and it ought, assuredly, to be without disguise to a man whom I wish no longer to look upon as an antagonist, but a friend.—

"I am, &c.

"R. WATSON."

This letter was published in Mr. Gibbon's Miscellaneous Works and Life in 1796, and no sooner published than noticed by the King, who spoke to me of it at his Levee, calling it an *odd* letter. I did not immediately recollect the purport of it; but on His Majesty's repeating his observation, it occurred to me, and I instantly said to him, that I had frequently met with respectable men, who cherished an expectation of a *future state,* though they rejected Christianity as an imposture, and that I thought my publicly declaring that I was of a contrary opinion might perhaps induce Mr. Gibbon, and other *such* men, to make a deeper investigation into the truth of religion than they had hitherto done. His Majesty expressed himself perfectly satisfied, both with my opinion and with

my motive for mentioning it to Mr. Gibbon.

In February, 1780, I preached, at the request of the Vice-Chancellor, the Fast Sermon before the University. A little before this time several counties had begun to follow the example of Yorkshire, in petitioning Parliament against the undue influence of the Crown; amongst the rest an ambiguous advertisement had been published by the Sheriff of Huntingdonshire, which gave occasion to the following letter to the Duke of Manchester, then Lord-Lieutenant of the county.

"Cambridge, Jan. 9th, 1780.

"My Lord Duke,

"As Regius Professor of Divinity, I have no inconsiderable property at Somersham. I observe a meeting of the county is advertised for an address to Parliament. If the address be designed to convey the most distant approbation of the public measures which have been carrying on for several years, I should be glad to have an

opportunity of giving it an hearty negative. I take the liberty of signifying this to Your Grace, because indispensable business in the University, on the day appointed for the meeting, will prevent my attendance at Huntingdon; and, if the opinion of an absent man can be of any weight, I should be happy to have mine expressed by Your Grace.

"I am, &c.

"R. WATSON."

In answer to a letter from the Duke of Manchester, informing me that a petition was intended, and pressing me to attend the county meeting, I sent the following reply.

"Cambridge, Jan. 13th, 1780.

"My Lord Duke,

"IT gives me real concern that public business, which cannot be put off, requires my presence at Cambridge on the day fixed for the county meeting at Huntingdon. Would to God there may be virtue and good sense enough in the kingdom to second the en-

deavours of those who are doing all they can to save their country; but the influence of the Crown (which has acquired its present strength, more, perhaps, from the additional increase of empire, commerce, and national wealth, than from any criminal desire to subvert the constitution,) has pervaded, I fear, the whole mass of the people. *Every man of consequence almost in the kingdom, has a son, relation, friend, or dependant, whom he wishes to provide for*; *and, unfortunately for the liberty of this country, the Crown has the means of gratifying the expectation of them all.*

"I do not think so ill of mankind, but that some men of integrity may be found who, in their public conduct, prefer the consciousness of acting right to every prospect of advantage; but their number is comparatively small, and is decreasing every day. The proposed petition to parliament is so true in its principles, so divested of party prejudices, so temperate in its expressions, and every way so adapted to do good, that I cannot question but it will meet with the approbation of the honest, the sensible, and

the disinterested of all sides. For my part, I beg leave to give it, with all possible truth and good conscience, my most hearty concurrence.

"I am, &c.

"R. WATSON."

The Duke of Manchester published these two letters without my privity; he ought certainly to have had my permission to have done it, but the publication gave me no concern; the letters contained my real sentiments, and I had no fear of having my sentiments known. I had not the usual prudence, shall I call it, or selfish caution, of my profession at any time of life.—*Ortus a quercu non a salice,* I knew not how to bend my principles to the circumstances of the times. I could not adopt that versatility of sentiment, which Lord Bacon, with his wonted sagacity, but with more of worldly wisdom than of honour, recommends in his eighth book *De Augmentis Scientiarum,* as necessary to a man occupied in the fabrication of his own fortune: *Ingenia,* he says, *gravia et solennia,*

et mutare nescia, plus plerumque habeant dignitatis quam felicitatis. Hoc vero vitium (I cannot esteem it a *vitium*) *in aliquibus a natura penitus insitum est, qui suopte ingenio sunt viscosi, et nodosi, et ad versandum inepti.* Were this viscosity, this nodosity of temper somewhat more common amongst us, (especially amongst the members of both Houses of Parliament,) I cannot think that either the public interest or private respectability of character would be lessened thereby. My Fast Sermon was eagerly bought up; the city of London purchased a whole edition of one thousand copies, which they distributed *gratis*. The Archbishop of Canterbury (Cornwallis) had expressed himself rather petulantly, in the presence of Lord Camden, against my sermon, "The Principles of the Revolution vindicated," and was reproved for it by His Lordship, who told him, that it contained the principles in which His Grace, as well as himself, had been educated. I sent a copy of my Fast Sermon to him with the following letter:

"Cambridge, Feb. 7, 1780.

"My Lord Archbishop,

"ONE of my sermons has, I have been informed, met with Your Grace's disapprobation; and this may have a similar fate. I have no wish but to speak what appears to me to be the truth, upon every occasion, and never yet thought of pleasing any person or party when I spoke from the pulpit; so that, if I am in an error, it is at least both involuntary and disinterested. I never come to London; but my situation in this place, sufficiently difficult and laborious, gives me, in the opinion of many, a right not to be overlooked, and it certainly gives me a right not to be misunderstood by the head of the Church.

"I am, &c.

"R. WATSON."

This letter was not at all calculated to promote a good understanding between the Archbishop and myself: but I was very indifferent about it, and I never afterwards troubled myself with him; for I had

no opinion of his abilities, and he was so wife-ridden, that I had no opinion of his politics. My predecessor had been fifteen, and I had been nine years Professor of Divinity, without either of us having been noticed, as to preferment, by either the Archbishop or the ministers of the Crown; and I had more pleasure in letting the Archbishop see that I was not to be intimidated, than I should have had in receiving from him the best thing in his gift, after a long servile attention.

My temper could never brook submission to the ordinary means of ingratiating myself with great men; and hence Dr. Hallifax, (afterwards Bishop of St. Asaph,) whose temper was different, called me one of the Βιασται; and he was right enough in the denomination. I was determined to be advanced in my profession by force of desert, or not at all. It has been said, (I believe by D'Alembert,) that the highest offices in church and state resemble a pyramid whose top is accessible to only two sorts of animals, eagles and reptiles. My

pinions were not strong enough to pounce upon its top, and I scorned by creeping to ascend its summit. Not that a bishoprick was then or ever an object of my ambition; for I considered the acquisition of it as no proof of personal merit, inasmuch as bishopricks are as often given to the flattering dependants, or to the unlearned younger branches of noble families, as to men of the greatest erudition; and I considered the possession of it as a frequent occasion of personal demerit; for I saw the generality of the Bishops bartering their independence, and the dignity of their order, for the chance of a translation, and polluting Gospel-humility by the pride of prelacy. I used then to say, and I say so still, render the office of a bishop respectable by giving some civil distinction to its possessor, in order that his example may have more weight with both the laity and clergy. Annex to each bishoprick some portion of the royal ecclesiastical patronage which is now prostituted by the Chancellor and the minister of the day to the purpose of parliamentary corruption, that

every Bishop may have means sufficient to reward all the deserving clergy of his diocese. Give every Bishop income enough, not for display of worldly pomp and fashionable luxury, but to enable him to maintain works of charity, and to make a decent provision for his family: but having done these things for him, take from him all hopes of a translation by equalizing the bishopricks. Oblige him to a longer residence in his diocese than is usually practised, that he may do the proper work of a Bishop; that he may direct and inspect the flock of Christ; that by his exhortations he may confirm the unstable, by his admonitions reclaim the reprobate, and by the purity of his life render religion amiable and interesting to all.

About this time my friend General Honeywood offered to give me for my life, and for the life of my wife, a neat house at the end of his park at Markshall in Essex. The situation was sufficiently attractive, and I wanted a place to retire to occasionally from my engagements at Cambridge; but

I thought as Marmontel had done on a similar present being offered him by M. de Marigny, *ce don étoit une chaine, et je n'en voulois point porter.*

In a little time after the publication of my Fast Sermon, a printed Letter was addressed to me by an anonymous correspondent. The Letter was written with some spirit, but with little argument. Not being of a resentful temper, I sent the following letter to the publisher of the pamphlet, and desired him to communicate it to the author.

"Sir,

"You have thought me worthy of your public correspondence. Whether you are really the old friend you pretend to be or not, permit me to assure you that I could wish you would come and spend a few days with me; my mind is open to conviction; your conversation might convert me, or mine might have the same effect on you. I never can have the least resentment against any one who differs

from me on principle, and you and I do not, probably, differ so much as you suppose; for my wishes to heal what I apprehend to be a dangerous wound in our civil constitution, will ever, I trust, be regulated by a regard for peace and Christian charity.

"Would to God the King of England had men of magnanimity enough in his councils, to advise him to meet, at this juncture, the wishes of his people; he would thereby become the idol of the nation, and the most admired monarch in Europe.

"*You mistake me, Sir, if you suppose that I have the most distant desire to make the democratic scale of the constitution outweigh the monarchical. Not one jot of the legal prerogative of the crown do I wish to see abolished; not one tittle of the King's influence in the state to be destroyed, except so far as it is extended over the representatives of the people.*

"There are a few mistakes in your publication, relative to the motives of my conduct. They may be involuntary mistakes, and as such I forgive them: they may be voluntary ones, and in that case, I wish

you may forgive yourself. As to any asperities in sentiment or expression into which you may have been betrayed, from thinking me a sad political criminal, who deserved chastisement, I heartily forgive them all, because I am conscious that they are all unmerited.

"I am, &c.

"R. WATSON."

I presently received a flimsy answer, to which I returned the following reply:—

"Cambridge, April 14, 1780.

"Sir,

"THOUGH an hour's conversation would bring us better acquainted with each other's sentiments, than a month's correspondence can do, yet I should think myself deficient in the common intercourses of social life, if I did not return you my acknowledgements for the regard you have expressed for my private character: the compliments you have paid me must be attributed to your partiality more than to my desert.

"You must excuse me, if I think that

the principles, which you admit to be true in theory, cannot be applied in practice. I am not very sanguine in my expectations of reform, but much may be done by honest men, and without blood; and whether any thing can be done or not, still must I hold it to be the duty of each individual firmly to profess what appears to him to be right, though all the world should be on the other side of the question. By a contrary conduct, many a moral and political evil has been established, and many a virtue banished from amongst mankind; just as many a battle has been lost, from each man saying, why should not I run away as well as the rest? which might have been won, if each man had said, I will stand and do my duty, let others do what they will.

"I am not the *Satan* you esteem me; for I do not think with Satan, that it is "better to reign in Hell, than serve in Heaven." But *I do think, that it is better to bask in the sun, and suck a fortuitous sustenance from the scanty drippings of the most barren rock in Switzerland, with freedom for*

my friend, than to batten as a slave, at the most luxurious table of the greatest despot on the globe.

"The King, notwithstanding, has not a more loyal subject, nor the constitution a warmer friend.

"I most readily submit to laws made by men exercising their free powers of deliberation for the good of the whole; but when the legislative assembly is actuated by an extrinsic spirit, then submission becomes irksome to me; then I begin to be alarmed; knowing with Hooker, that to *live by one man's will, becomes the cause of all men's misery.* I dread despotism worse than death; and the despotism of a Parliament worse than that of a King; but I hope the time will never come, when it will be necessary for me to declare that I will submit to neither. I shall probably be rotten in my grave, before I see what you speak of, the tyranny of a George the Sixth, or of a Cromwell: and it may be that I want philosophy in interesting myself in political disquisitions, in apprehending what may never happen; but I conceive that I am

to live in society in another state, and a sober attachment to theoretic principles of political truth cannot be an improper ingredient in a social character, either in this world or in the next.

"You think the county-members as obnoxious to influence as the borough-members. This theory is not confirmed by observation; for in the great division on the 6th of April, the boroughs of Cornwall alone furnished twenty-seven voters, and the Cinque Ports thirteen, in support of the influence of the crown, and all the counties in England and Wales did not furnish twelve. But I forbear entering into the argument of either your public or private letter. I am persuaded you mean as well as myself, and I leave the matter in dispute between us to the judgment of the public.

"I really have no fair ground of suspecting to whom it is that I am writing, nor have I any curiosity on the subject; it is enough for me to know that I am writing to a gentleman of genius and ability who wishes me no ill, and to one who is philo-

sopher enough to excuse the diversities of men's opinions on most intellectual subjects, knowing that they are to be explained upon much the same principles by which he would explain the differences observable in their statures and complexions.

"I am, &c.

"R. WATSON."

I received another letter from my anonymous correspondent, in which he confessed that his pamphlet did not sell, and that my sermon was much read. He requested me at the same time not to publish his letters. Several years afterwards I understood that I was indebted to a man I had no acquaintance with (Mr. Cumberland) for this notice. Upon another occasion he published what he thought an answer to my letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury. I had too great contempt for his powers of argumentation to answer any thing he published against me: he had merit as a versifier and a writer of essays, but his head was not made for close reasoning. There are, says Locke, "some men of one,

"some of two syllogisms and no more, and "others that can advance but one step further. These cannot always discern that "side on which the strongest proofs lie." Mr. Cumberland was at most a two syllogism man.

I had some time before this applied to the Duke of Rutland, to forward a petition in Cambridgeshire upon the plan of the Yorkshire petition: but I soon found that even His Grace's concurrence could not conciliate to such a measure some of the leading gentlemen in the county. Many respectable families in Cambridgeshire had, during the preceding reign, been avowed Jacobites, and in this they were professed supporters of the Tory system. Passing, therefore, over the gentlemen, we got an hundred principal yeomen to sign a requisition to the sheriff to call a county-meeting. This requisition the sheriff refused to comply with: upon his refusal the meeting was called by the yeomen who had signed the requisition to the sheriff, and it was very well attended by persons of all ranks. The

meeting was holden in the Senate-house-yard, as the county-hall could not contain the numbers, on the 25th of March, 1780. Lord Duncannon was appointed chairman of the meeting; and the following petition, which I had previously prepared, was read, and almost unanimously approved of; for, on a shew of hands, only one or two were held up against it.

"To the Honourable the Commons of Great Britain in Parliament assembled: the Petition of the Gentlemen, Clergy, and Freeholders of the County of Cambridge,

Sheweth,

"THAT your petitioners do thus publicly declare their entire and zealous approbation of the legislature of this country, as placed in the *free and independent* concurrence of King, Lords, and Commons, in preference to every other mode of civil government. That they anxiously wish the blessing of this form of legislation to be continued to their latest posterity, in its

constitutional purity. That they seriously apprehend this form of legislation will be essentially *vitiated,* if not virtually *changed,* whenever the treasure and offices of the community shall be successfully employed to bring the representatives of the people under the undue influence of the executive government. That they conceive a strong tendency to the change is at present, and has formerly been, too notorious to admit of doubt or to require proof. That they conceive every *system of public administration carried on by means of parliamentary corruption, however sanctioned by time, precedent, or authority, to be absolutely unjustifiable upon every principle of good sense, and sound policy; to be as dishonourable to the upright intentions of the Crown, as it is burdensome to the property, and dangerous to the liberty of the people.*

" Your petitioners do therefore most solemnly apply themselves to the honour, the justice, the integrity of this honourable House, praying that effectual measures may be taken by this House to enquire into and correct any gross abuses in the ex-

penditure of public money, to reduce all exorbitant emoluments of office, to rescind and abolish all sinecure places and unmerited pensions, and to use all such other constitutional means, as may tend to establish the independence of Parliament on the most lasting foundations.

"And your petitioners are the more earnest in their prayer, because they are of opinion that no other expedient can equally tend to heal our domestic divisions, to unite the whole nation in the warmest support of his Majesty's person and government, against the unprovoked hostilities of the house of Bourbon, and to put a final period to that primary source of national distress, the American war."

After the petition was agreed to by the county-meeting, a committee was established for promoting the object of the petition, and the meeting was adjourned to the 10th of the following April. The Duke of Rutland was made chairman of the committee, which consisted of fifty-one members. He requested that I would be a delegate from

JOBE M

the county of Cambridge, to meet the delegates, which were to be sent from other counties, in London; but this office I refused to accept. He imagining that my refusal proceeded from an apprehension of being ill thought of at court, jocularly said, *You must be forced down the King's throat as well as the rest of us.* I assured him that my refusal proceeded from a regard to my situation; that I did not think it suitable to my station as a clergyman, and especially as a Professor of Divinity, to enter so deeply into political contentions.

On the 6th of April, four days before our second county-meeting, the House of Commons took the petitions of the people into consideration, and authenticated the grievances therein complained of. The minister was beat upon the main question, by a majority of 233 to 215. The three following resolutions were passed by the House on that ever memorable day.

"1. That it is necessary to declare, that the influence of the Crown has in-

creased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished.

"2. That it is competent to the House of Commons to examine into, and to correct abuses in the expenditure of the civil list revenues, as well as in every other branch of the public revenue, whenever it shall seem expedient to the wisdom of the House so to do.

"3. That it is the duty of the House of Commons to provide, as far as may be, an immediate and effectual redress of the abuses complained of in the petitions presented to the House from the different counties, cities, and towns of this kingdom."

Glorious resolutions these! fit to be inscribed on tablets of gold, and hung up in both Houses of Parliament, to inform succeeding ages, that the principles of the Revolution stimulated, in 1780, a majority of the House of Commons to struggle against the danger impending over the constitution from the increased and increasing influence of the Crown!!!

Before these resolutions were passed in the House of Commons, I had prepared a plan of association for the county of Cambridge, in which the main things insisted on were, the not suffering any candidate for the county to be at any expense, on account of the votes and interest of the associates,—and the not supporting any candidate at the next general election, who would not engage to vote for triennial Parliaments. Despairing of rendering the electors honest, or the elected incorruptible at once, I thought that an election without expense, and a triennial Parliament, were the first means towards accomplishing a thorough reformation of the constitution. I differed in this opinion from some of those whom I considered as the first Whigs of the country; but their arguments appeared to me to bear a temporising cast, and as I had no sinister end in view, I could not bring myself to give up my own opinion to theirs. Mr. Burke had much influence with them; I admired, as every body did, the talents, but I did not admire the principles, of that

gentleman. His opposition to the clerical petition first excited my suspicion of his being an high churchman in religion, and his virulent abuse of Doctor Price persuaded me that he was a Tory, perhaps, indeed, an aristocratic Tory, in the state. Our petition had been signed by near a thousand freeholders in less than a week; there was a great dislike in the county to an association, and thinking that no good could be derived from an association, that was not generally approved of, I drew up the following paper, as a more conciliatory measure to the county, and a more respectful one to the House of Commons. The Duke of Rutland, as Chairman of the Committee, read both the plan of association, and the following paper, to the Committee before we went to the County Hall, on the day appointed for the meeting; and a majority of the Committee being of opinion, that an association should not then take place, the following paper was delivered to Lord Duncannon, Chairman of the meeting and read by him to the freeholders assembled in the County Hall on the 16th of April, 1780:—

"WHEREAS the Committee, appointed at the last county meeting, for effectually promoting the object of the petition to Parliament then agreed to; and for preparing a plan of association on legal and constitutional grounds, to support the laudable reform therein recommended; and for adopting such other measures as may conduce to restore the independence of Parliament, have received authentic information, that the general allegation of the said petition, and of many other petitions from various counties, cities, and boroughs, respecting the influence of the executive government over the representatives of the people, hath been taken into consideration, and admitted by the Honourable the Commons of Great Britain in Parliament assembled to be just and well founded; and whereas the said Commons have resolved, that the increased and increasing influence of the Crown (or in words to that effect) ought to be diminished; and whereas this very important resolution was followed by other resolutions, tending to a laudable reform in the expenditure of public money,

and to the establishing the independence of Parliament on the most lasting foundations: the Committee, taking these and other circumstances into their most serious consideration, and being desirous of shewing all proper respect to the deliberations, and of placing a due reliance on the discretion and integrity, of the representatives of the people, do for these reasons decline, for the present, proposing any plan of association; sincerely trusting that the House of Commons, having made so noble a beginning, will be animated with a proper zeal to persevere in deserving the highest confidence, and the warmest thanks, of their constituents and fellow-subjects. The Committee are thoroughly sensible, that from the vicissitudes incident to all human establishments, the civil constitution of this country hath suffered in the course of less than a century some change, and that it doth at present stand in need of some reform; but whether that reform may be best accomplished by recurring to triennial Parliaments; by disfranchising the lesser boroughs; by increasing the number of

the Knights of the Shires; by regulating the expenditure of public money; or by other means, they do not at present think proper to declare their opinions; being persuaded that the Commons of Great Britain in Parliament assembled, having signified their inclination to make a reform, do not stand in need of being instructed in the mode of doing it. The Committee, being actuated by the most unfeigned regard for the constitution of their country, feel a satisfaction which cannot be expressed, in hoping that the representatives of the people, called upon, as they are, by the voice of the people, will unite in healing our internal divisions, by confirming our confidence in their integrity; *will conspire as zealously in protecting the prerogative of the Crown from all attempts to lessen it, as in protecting the representatives of the people from that corrupting influence, which forebodes the ruin of the constitution, and which they in their wisdom have already resolved ought to be diminished.*"

This paper was agreed to by the meeting, which was then adjourned *sine die*, subject

to the call of the Committee; and the Committee was adjourned *sine die*, subject to the call of the Chairman.

Upon subsequent questions in the House of Commons, which tended to realise the general proposition concerning the reduction of the influence of the Crown, the Minister so successfully exerted that influence, that nothing effectual was done, and he continued in office, contrary to the sense of the people, shewn not only by the petitions of the people out of Parliament, but by their representatives in Parliament, who had, on more occasions than one, outvoted him on important questions. In preceding reigns ministers were dismissed when they lost the confidence of the people, but there was no Pretender to the throne of George the Third!!!

An insurrection, on the score of religion, soon after happened in London; and this circumstance, though wholly unconnected with the petitioning interest of the kingdom, very much disheartened the friends of re-

form, and imboldened the Tories to circulate the basest calumnies against the principal Lords and Commons then in opposition to the ministry. I myself saw a letter from the then Archbishop of York (Markham) accusing them of being the fomenters of the riots. I mention this, not with a desire of stigmatising a man, in many respects estimable, but to guard other zealots from supporting their party by uncharitable judgments—an "evil tongue," is censurable in any man, but is past bearing in an Archbishop. I from this time clearly saw that the Crown, through the instrumentality of influenced Parliaments, could do any thing. The mischief of the American war was carried on under the sanction of Parliament, and every other mischief will be carried on in the same way; for a minister would want common sense to run any risk in taking upon himself responsibility for obnoxious measures, when he could secure the consent of Parliament to almost any measure he might propose. I see not, in the nature of our government, any remedy for this evil. You cannot take from the

Crown the means of influencing Parliament, by lodging these means in any other hands, without destroying the constitution, and you cannot (such is the largeness of your debt, your commerce, your army, your navy, and the extent of your empire) extinguish those means. A few real patriots may sigh over this tendency of our constitution to despotism, and it may, from time to time, meet with some obstruction, not only from the virtue of individuals in and out of Parliament, but from the moderation and the wisdom of the Crown itself, but it will ultimately prevail. Such were my sentiments above thirty years ago; and nothing has since happened to make me change them, but many, many things to confirm them.

In May, 1780, I published a Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Ely, at my Primary Visitation. This Charge was principally intended to recommend an establishment at Cambridge, for the express purpose of translating and publishing Oriental Manuscripts wherever found. And

I hinted, that the then litigated estate of Sir *Jacob Downing* might, when adjudged to the University, be properly employed in supporting an Oriental College. This Discourse was republished, without my consent being asked, at Calcutta in 1785, and made the first article of the first volume of the Asiatic Miscellany. Among other complimentary letters sent me on this occasion, I received one from Dr. Keene, Bishop of Ely, in which he expressed his wishes, that I had formed my character solely upon the learning and ability (he was pleased to say) I possessed, and not on politics. This bishop of Ely had been made a bishop by the Duke of Newcastle, for supporting the Whig interest in the University of Cambridge in the late reign; I therefore instantly returned him the following answer, which was no more than his apostasy from Whiggism deserved:—

"Cambridge, May 28, 1786.

"My Lord,

"I AM much flattered by Your Lord-

ship's approbation of my Charge. My politics may hurt my interest, but they will not hurt my honour. They are the politics of *Locke*, of *Somers*, and of *Hooker*, and in the reign of George the Second they were the politics of this University.

"I am, &c.

"R. WATSON."

Seeing the readiness with which the petition had been signed by the freeholders in the county of Cambridge, I persuaded the Duke of Rutland to offer his brother (Lord Robert Manners) for the county, at the general election in 1780. The two other candidates were, Mr. Yorke (the present Lord Hardwicke), and Sir Sampson Gideon (now Lord Eardley). The whole planning and conducting of this business fell upon me. My tolerating principles had gained me the esteem of the Presbyterian Dissenters, and their support contributed essentially to the carrying the election on the 14th of September, 1780. The poll was finished, by my contrivance, as to the manner of taking the votes, in a few hours, by which

a very great expense was saved to all the candidates, and all tumult was avoided. With the transactions by which the borough of Cambridge was afterwards thrown into the power of the Rutland family I had no concern: I would not become an instrument in ministerial traffic for a rotten borough.

In February, 1781, I received a letter from the Duke of Rutland, informing me that the rectory of Knaptoft in Leicestershire, in his patronage, was vacant, and offering me the presentation to it. This favour was given me without any solicitation on my part, and it was given me I believe, not so much as a reward for the service I had rendered him in the Cambridgeshire election, as for the extraordinary attention I had paid to him during the course of his education at Cambridge. I was just then printing the first two volumes of my Chemical Essays, and I had great pleasure in dedicating them to His Grace.

On the 26th of July, 1781, I was seized

with a dangerous fever, the peccant matter of which being probably locked up by an improper use of large doses of bark, reduced me in a few weeks to the lowest state. When the faculty had given me over, and I was in a state of insensibility, my wife saved my life by boldly giving me at once a whole paper of James's Powder; it operated as an emetic, I discharged a vast quantity of putrid bile, &c. and slept soundly for seven hours after the operation. I continued, however, still very weak, and went in October into Westmoreland, to try if my native air would re-establish my health: but neither air nor diet, nor the art of healing, nor a much better thing than the art of healing, a good constitution, have enabled me to get the better of the original disorder, which Sir Richard Jebb called a paralysis of the stomach. Our two principal physicians at Cambridge showed the sagacity of their judgment, for Professor Plumptree said, that I should take a great deal of pulling down; and Dr. Glynne said, that I should never get the better of the disorder. I am not

yet quite pulled down, nor have I any prospect of getting well. It has been a great happiness to me during this long illness, that my spirits have never failed me. I have considered, during every period of my life, pain as a positive evil which every percipient being must be desirous of escaping; but death is a door of entrance into a better life, which may, by a sincere Christian, be considered as a blessing—*Thanks be to God for the inestimable gift of eternal life, through Jesus Christ!*

In March, 1782, Soame Jenyns published his Disquisitions on Various Subjects. The seventh disquisition was wholly opposite to the principles of government which I had maintained in the sermon intitled, the Principles of the Revolution Vindicated; and that sermon was evidently glanced at in some parts of the Disquisition. This Toryism vexed me, and though I was very ill at the time, I instantly wrote an answer to it. I did not get Mr. Jenyns's book till Thursday in the afternoon, and I sent off the answer to it, to be printed in London, on the evening of the next day,

under the title of, An Answer to the Disquisition on Government, in a letter to the author of Disquisitions on Several Subjects.

I had severity enough in my disposition, had I indulged it, to have written bitter replies to whatever was published against me; but partly from the pride of conscious political innocence, and partly from a principle of Christian forbearance, I took no notice of the senseless malignity of any of them.

On the 25th of March, 1782, a total change of ministry took place. I happened then to be in London, and had the honour of dining with Lord Rockingham on that day. When we were alone after dinner, he gave me an account of the manner in which the change of administration had been effected; and he read to me the several propositions to which he required the King's explicit consent, before he would accept the office of First Lord of the Treasury. The propositions were of the utmost public importance; such as,—There being no *veto* put on the acknowledging the in-

dependence of America—The suffering the Contractors and Custom-House Officers' Bill to pass—the reduction of the influence of the Crown, by the abolition of useless offices—The introduction of a system of general economy in every department of the state.

In the course of the conversation on public matters, which I then had with the Minister, I took occasion to say, that among other subjects of reform, I hoped he would think of reforming the bench of Bishops. He asked, by what means?—I answered, the best means might not be practicable, without exciting too great a ferment in the country, but that the rendering the Bishops *independent* in the House of Lords by taking away translations, would, I thought, be a measure exceedingly useful in a political light; this, I added, might be done without injuring any individual, by annexing, as the sees became vacant, part of the property of the rich bishoprics to the poorer ones, so as to bring the whole as near as possible to an equality. The revenues of

the bishoprics, when thus equalised, would, I apprehended, be a sufficient maintenance for all the bishops, without suffering any of them to hold *commendams*. His Lordship thanked me for the hint, and said, that he should be happy to have an opportunity of serving the public in serving me. I answered, that I would never be troublesome to him in asking for any thing.

Several counties presented addresses to the King on the change of the ministry; and I drew up the following for the County of Cambridge, which was unanimously approved of at a County meeting on the 8th of June, 1782.

"Most gracious Sovereign,

"WE Your Majesty's loyal subjects, freeholders and other inhabitants of the county of Cambridge, beg leave to approach your throne; and we approach it with, we *presume*, a well-grounded confidence that you will be graciously pleased to accept our thanks, which we now tender to your Majesty, for your paternal goodness

to your people, shown in your confiding your councils and the administration of public measures to men of approved integrity, consummate ability, intelligent activity, undoubted loyalty, and firm attachment to the genuine constitution of their country.

"Under the auspices of such an administration, we trust that our enemies of the house of Bourbon will yet be humbled; that our ancient Allies will see cause to regret their (Holland leagued with France) new connections, and that our brethren in America will not be averse from peace.—We sincerely congratulate Your Majesty on the success of your arms in the East and West Indies, as a probable mean of effectuating these ends.

"Persuaded that by such ministers our money will not be misapplied, we will with cheerfulness submit to any burden, which may enable Your Majesty to convince the Powers of Europe, that you have the singular felicity of reigning over a *free and magnanimous people, impatient of the most distant tendency to despotism, but above all*

others affectionate to their Prince, and zealous for his glory.

"Convinced that a system of parliamentary corruption is derogatory from the wisdom and equity of Your Majesty's government; expensive to the state, and ruinous to the constitution; we beg leave to express our hearty approbation of the measures which Your Majesty's ministers have taken in parliament to destroy it; and at the same time to testify our most cordial thanks to Your Majesty for the greatness of mind displayed in your concurring with such salutary councils. *What more remains to be done, we doubt not will be done, with as just a regard to the monarchical as to the democratical part of the constitution; for we are not of those who wish the constitution were altered, but restored to its original purity.*"

In composing this address, and indeed in all my other political writings and speeches, I seem to have forgotten that I lived in *Romuli fæce*, and not in *Platonis* Πολιτεια.

On coming home (July 2, 1782) from

creating the doctors in the Senate-House, I was informed that Lord Rockingham had died the day before. This would have been a dreadful blow to a man of ambition, but it gave me no concern on my own account; for though he had flatteringly told me, that he was so perfectly satisfied with my public conduct, that he should be glad of an opportunity of serving the country in serving me, yet I had no expectation that he had then an intention (as I was afterwards told by Lord John Cavendish he had) of promoting me to a bishopric. I sincerely regretted the great loss which the public sustained by his death; for he was a minister of greater ability than was generally believed, and he possessed that integrity of constitutional principle, without which the greatest ability is calculated only to do great mischief.

When Lord John Cavendish informed me of Lord Rockingham's intention towards me, he informed me also, that I might apply with probable effect either to the Duke of Grafton or the Duke of Rut-

land; but I made no application to either of them; I called however at Euston on the following Monday, in my way to Yarmouth.

The Duke of Grafton then told me that the Bishop of Landaff (Barrington) would probably be translated to the See of Salisbury, which had become vacant a few days before the death of Lord Rockingham, and that he had asked Lord Shelburne, who had been appointed First Lord of the Treasury, to permit me to succeed to the bishopric of Landaff. This unsolicited kindness of the Duke of Grafton gratified my feelings very much, for my spirit of independence was ever too high for my circumstances.— Lord Shelburne, the Duke informed me, seemed very well disposed towards me, but would not suffer him to write to me; and he had asked the Duke whether he thought the appointment would be agreeable to the Duke of Rutland. Notwithstanding this hint, I could not bring myself to write to the Duke of Rutland, who had not at that time forsaken the friends of

Lord Rockingham. I knew his great regard for me, but I abhorred the idea of pressing a young nobleman to ask a favour of the new minister, which might in its consequences sully the purity of his political principles, and be the means of attaching him without due consideration to Lord Shelburne's administration. Not that I had any reason to think ill of the new minister: I was personally unacquainted with him, but I was no stranger to the talents he had shown in opposing Lord North's American war; and Lord Rockingham had told me, that Lord Shelburne had behaved very honourably to him in not accepting the Treasury, which the King had offered to him in preference to Lord Rockingham. I mention this circumstance in mere justice to Lord Shelburne; whose constitutional principles and enlarged views of public policy rendered him peculiarly fitted to sustain the character of a great statesman in the highest office.

On the 12th of the same month, the Duke of Rutland wrote to me at Yarmouth — that he had *determined to support*

Lord Shelburne's administration, as he had received the most positive assurances, that the independency of America was to be acknowledged, and the wishes of the people relative to a parliamentary reform granted. He further told me, that the bishopric of Landaff, he had reason to believe, would be disposed of in my favour if *he asked it*; and desired to know, whether, if the offer should be made, I would accept it. I returned for answer that I conceived there could be no dishonour in *my accepting a bishopric* from an administration which he had previously *determined* to support; and that I had expected Lord Shelburne would have given me the bishopric without application, but that if I must owe it to the interposition of some great man, I had rather owe it to that of His Grace than to any other.

On Sunday, July 21st, I received an express from the Duke of Rutland, informing me that he had seen Lord Shelburne, who had *anticipated* his wishes, by mentioning me for the vacant bishopric *before he had*

asked it. I kissed hands on the 26th of that month, and was received, as the phrase is, *very graciously*; this was the first time that I had ever been at St. James's.

In this manner did I acquire a bishopric. But I have no great reason to be proud of the promotion; for I think I owed it not to any regard, which he who gave it me, had to the zeal and industry with which I had for many years discharged the functions, and fulfilled the duties, of an academic life; but to the opinion which, from my Sermon, he had erroneously entertained, that I was a warm, and might become an useful partisan. Lord Shelburne, indeed, had expressed to the Duke of Grafton his expectation, that I would occasionally write a pamphlet for their administration. The Duke did me justice in assuring him, that he had perfectly mistaken my character; that though I might write on an abstract question, concerning government or the principles of legislation, it would not be with a view of assisting any administration.

I had written in support of the principles of the Revolution, because I thought those principles useful to the state, and I saw them vilified and neglected; I had taken part with the people in their petitions against the influence of the Crown, because I thought that influence would destroy the constitution, and I saw that it was increasing; I had opposed the supporters of the American war, because I thought that war not only to be inexpedient, but unjust. But all this was done from my own sense of things, and without the least view of pleasing any party: I did, however, happen to please a party, and they made me a bishop. I have hitherto followed, and shall continue to follow, my own judgment in all public transactions; all parties now understand this, and it is probable that I may continue to be Bishop of Landaff as long as I live. Be it so. Wealth and power are but secondary objects of pursuit to a thinking man, especially to a thinking Christian.

At my first interview with Lord Shel-

burne, he expressed a desire that we might become well acquainted; and said, that as he had *Dunning* to assist him in law points, and *Barry* in army concerns, he should be happy to consult me in church matters. I determined to make use of this overture as a mean of doing, as I hoped, some service to religion, and to the Established Church; which from a most serious and unprejudiced consideration, I had long thought stood in great need of a fundamental reform.

A few days after this first interview, the Minister told me, that he had from the first fixed upon me for the bishopric of Landaff. I firmly asked him, why he had not then given it to me, without waiting for the interference of any person? He said, he had given it without being asked by the Duke of Rutland; but he acknowledged, that he wanted to please the Duke in the business. I replied, that I supposed every minister was desirous of making a piece of preferment go as far as possible in creating obligations; but that I should have been

better pleased had he given me the bishopric at once. I then informed him, that I had something to say to him, which required a little leisure to discuss. He appointed a day on which I was to dine with him; and on that day (September 5th, 1782,) I delivered into his hands the following paper, the subjects of which had much engaged my attention before I was a bishop: and I did not think, that, by becoming a bishop, I ought to change the principles which I had imbibed from the works of Mr. Locke:

"There are several circumstances respecting the *Doctrine*, the *Jurisdiction*, and the *Revenue* of the Church of England, which would probably admit a temperate reform. If it should be thought right to attempt making a change in any of them, it seems most expedient to begin with the revenue.

"The two following hints on that subject may not be undeserving your Lordship's consideration:—First, a bill to render the bishoprics more equal to each other,

T. L. TALBOURE

both with respect to income and patronage; by annexing, as the richer bishoprics become vacant, a part of their revenues, and a part of their patronage, to the poorer. By a bill of this kind, the bishops would be freed from the necessity of holding ecclesiastical preferments, *in commendam*,—a practice which bears hard on the rights of the inferior clergy. Another probable consequence of such a bill would be, a longer residence of the bishops in their several dioceses; from which the best consequences, both to religion, the morality of the people, and to the true credit of the church, might be expected; for the two great inducements, to wish for translations, and consequently to reside in London, namely, superiority of income, and excellency of patronage, would in a great measure be removed.

"Secondly, a bill for appropriating, as they become vacant, an half, or a third part, of the income of every deanery, prebend, or canonry, of the churches of Westminster, Windsor, Canterbury, Christ Church, Worcester, Durham, Ely, Norwich, &c. to the

same purposes, *mutatis mutandis*, as the first fruits and tenths were appropriated by Queen Anne. By a bill of this kind, a decent provision would be made for the inferior clergy, in a third or fourth part of the time which Queen Anne's bounty alone will require to effect. A decent provision being once made for every officiating minister in the church, the *residence of the clergy on their cures might more reasonably be required*, than it can be at present, and the licence of holding more livings than one, be restricted."

When I delivered this paper to Lord Shelburne, I told him that I had long weighed the subject, but that I was not disposed to introduce it into Parliament, if it met with his disapprobation, as I neither wanted to embarrass his administration, nor wished to risk the loss of the plan, by having it brought forward in opposition to the ministry. Lord Shelburne having, at a former interview with him, asked, *en passant*, if nothing could be gotten from the church, towards alleviating the burdens of the state,

I observed to him on this occasion, that the whole revenue of the church would not yield, if it were equally divided, which could not be thought of, above 150*l.* a year to each clergyman, a provision which, I presumed, he would not think too ample; so that any diminution of the church revenue seemed to me highly inexpedient in a political light, unless government would be contented to have a beggarly and illiterate clergy, an event which no wise minister would ever wish to see. Thus, at the very outset of my episcopal life, did I endeavour to protect the church, though my enemies have constantly represented me as desirous to injure it.

Being strongly persuaded of the utility of my plan, I thought the best way of accomplishing it would be to state it clearly, and to submit it to the perusal of those who might be most instrumental in forwarding or obstructing it. In pursuit of this idea, I drew up a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and privately printed four copies. I sent one copy to Lord Shelburne, one to

the Duke of Grafton, one to the Duke of Rutland, and one to Lord John Cavendish, with a letter to each of them.

Letter to Lord Shelburne, with a printed copy of one to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"Cambridge, Nov. 10, 1782.

"My Lord,

"When Your Lordship first acquainted me with His Majesty's intention to promote me to the See of Landaff, you not only informed me of the sincere dispositions of both Their Majesties to serve the cause of Christianity, but you wished me to turn my thoughts that way: I herewith send Your Lordship some observations on a Reform in the Church, which I am firmly convinced, might be very quietly made, and which would be exceedingly useful in a religious view. I wish Your Lordship to let me know whether you see any reason against submitting this matter to the judgment of the public. If, after it has been thoroughly sifted, it should be found reasonable to adopt the change proposed,

Your Lordship will derive no discredit from supporting it, nor will the support of it create any disturbance to your administration.

"I flatter myself, that I am writing to a minister who does not come under Grotius's description; and indeed, unless I could disbelieve the testimony of all who know him, I may be sure that he does not: *Politici, qui sæpe dogmata vera a falsis, salubria a noxiis, non norunt distinguere, omnia nova suspecta habent.*

"Perhaps there would be no impropriety in laying the proposed change in the establishment of the church, before His Majesty, as being, under Christ, its chief head. I am so far from having any objection to this, that I could wish, were it proper, it might be done; and whether it be proper or not, I beg leave to crave Your Lordship's good offices, in assuring His Majesty of my sincere respect and duty in this, and every other matter civil and religious.

"I am, &c.

"R. Landaff."

My political principles, I knew, were not of a courtly cast, and I had expressed myself so unequivocally on that subject in my sermon on "The Principles of the Revolution vindicated," that I wanted to prevent the King's being prejudiced on that account against my plan; and I thought, if he read the letter calmly, he could not disapprove of any part of it.

Lord Shelburne's Answer to my Letter.

"My dear Lord,

"I HAVE read your letter to the Archbishop attentively, though hastily. I own to you, that I am satisfied that it is impossible to effect either of the propositions contained in it, in the present moment, and therefore only, improper to attempt either at this moment. I trust, as you do me so much justice in other respects, you will in this, by supposing me penetrated with the horrid situation of the lower clergy, and thoroughly sensible of the advantages, which would result to society and the public, from making it more comfortable and more re-

spectable whenever a favourable opportunity presents itself. I have not time to tell Your Lordship all that occurs to me on this subject by letter. I hope we shall meet on the 26th, and to have frequent opportunities of conversing with Your Lordship on these and other matters. In the mean time, if I might take the liberty, I would earnestly dissuade any immediate publication.

"I am, &c.

"SHELBURNE."

To this letter of Lord Shelburne's I sent the following answer, though I was sensible that non-acquiescence in a minister's opinions, was not the way to conciliate his regard.

"Cambridge, Nov. 15, 1782.

"My Lord,

"THE impossibility of effecting either of the propositions in the present moment, (supposing it in deference to Your Lordship's judgment, rather than admitting it to exist,) is certainly a good reason for not

bringing the matter at the present moment before Parliament; but it is no reason, I humbly think, against doing all that was intended by the letter, submitting it to public discussion. I have this business so much at heart, that, in order to effect it, I will readily abandon the great prospects which my time of life, connexions, and situation open to me, in as probable a manner as they are opened to most other bishops on the bench. I anxiously wish for Your Lordship's concurrence. It is a good work, it will give all those who forward it outward credit and inward content. I pray you think of it at your leisure. I will certainly postpone the publication till I have seen Your Lordship.

"I am, &c.

"R. LANDAFF."

In my letter to Lord John Cavendish, who was then in opposition, (and whom I did not acquaint with my correspondence with Lord Shelburne, hoping by that means to have secured the concurrence of both parties,) I requested him simply to tell me,

whether he thought that the intended publication would do me any discredit, or the public any service, I had a good opinion of Lord John's ability and integrity, and weight with the House of Commons, and I shall neither hurt the cause nor his character by publishing the answer which he sent me.

"Billing, Nov. 21, 1782.

"My Lord,

"I was absent from home all last week, so that I did not get your letter till my return. You do me too much honour in thinking my opinion on such a subject worthy any notice. I have read the letter to the Archbishop with my best attention, and am perfectly satisfied that it ought not to be the cause of discredit to any man, but on the contrary do him the highest honour. The objects of it are not only rational, but such as seem to me a great improvement both in a religious and political light; and are stated with great clearness and temper. As to the chance of doing good I cannot be so sanguine, as I

should think it had not at present much chance of success. Corrections of this sort are not often brought to bear at the first trial. You are a much better judge than I am how far such a proposal will be agreeable to the cautious disposition of your brethren.

"I am, &c.

"J. CAVENDISH."

Upon my going to London at the meeting of parliament, I saw the Duke of Grafton, and had a long conversation with him upon the subject of my letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury. He approved of the plans, and expressed his approbation of them in the most open and sincere manner, but told me that Lord Shelburne was against the immediate publication of the letter, for reasons which did not at all satisfy him. The Duke informed me that he had communicated the matter to Lord Camden. I soon after saw Lord Camden, when he was pleased to say, "that every line in the letter was right, but that it would take me twenty years to overcome

men's prejudices." When he was afterwards President of the Council for many years, he never gave me the least intimation of his being disposed to assist in promoting a measure which he had so much approved.

On the 29th of the same month I dined with Lord Shelburne. In a conversation after dinner, he requested me not to publish the letter to the Archbishop. I asked him why? He replied, it was not the time! That, I rejoined, was always the answer of a statesman when he disliked a proposition, and that I wished he would plainly say, that he disliked it. He observed, that was not the case, but that he wished it to be put off a year or two. Having had reason to suspect that he had a disposition to be nibbling at the revenues of the Church, and being certain that they only wanted to be generally understood in order to their being secured, I boldly told him, that I would not put off the publication if there was any intention of taking any thing from the Church for the benefit of the State. He assured me that he had no such inten-

tion, and that the Universities, too, should remain untouched: I then said to him, that I did not see how I could answer to my conscience deferring the publication of the plan, which appeared to me so very useful. He replied, that he would answer it to me with his existence, that the business should at another time be done much more effectually. I was unwilling that this solemn asseveration should be retracted or explained away. I did not therefore open my lips in reply, but bowing took my leave.—Thus did I, before I had been six months on the bench, attempt in the most prudent way I could think of, to make a beginning of that reform in the Church, which I sincerely thought would be for the good of mankind, the stability of the Church establishment, and the advancement of genuine Christianity. A review of the doctrine and of the discipline of our Church, and a complete purgation of it from the dregs of Popery, and the impiety of Calvinism, would have properly followed a wise distribution of its revenue; and the liberation of its Bishops from ministerial influence would have destroyed that

secularity, to the attacks of which they are exposed, and rendered them more Christian. I have never lost sight of this object, and when in the year 1800, a kind of opening was given me to be of service in this matter, it will appear that I did not neglect it.

Towards the end of the following February (1783) Lord Shelburne resigned the office of First Lord of the Treasury, and in April following a new ministry, usually called the *Coalition* Ministry, was formed; a great cry was every where raised against Lord Shelburne, whether justly or not, may be doubted; I will mention, however, one anecdote to his honour as a man of integrity; his ability was never questioned:— On the day in which the peace was to be debated in the two Houses of Parliament, I happened to stand next him in the House of Lords, and asked him, whether he was to be turned out by the disapprobation of the Commons; he replied, that he could not certainly tell what would be the temper of that House, but he could say that

he had not expended a shilling of the public money to procure its approbation, though he well knew that above sixty thousand pounds had been expended in procuring an approbation of the peace in 1763.

After the death of Lord Rockingham, the King had appointed Lord Shelburne to the Treasury, without the knowledge, at least without waiting for the recommendation of the Cabinet. This exertion of the prerogative being contrary to the manner, in which government had been carried on during the reigns of George the First and Second by the great Whig families of the country, and differences also having happened between Lord Shelburne and some of the principal members of the Cabinet, even during the life-time of Lord Rockingham, many of them resigned their situations on his being made Prime Minister, and united with Lord North and his friends to force him from his office. From the moment this coalition was formed between Lord North and the men who had for many years reprobated, in the strongest terms,

his political principles, I lost all confidence in public men. I had, through life, been a strenuous supporter of the principles of the Revolution, and had attached myself, in some degree, to that party which professed to act upon them: but in their coalescing with the Tories to turn out Lord Shelburne, they destroyed my opinion of their disinterestedness and integrity. I clearly saw that they sacrificed their public principles to private pique, and their honour to their ambition. The badness of the peace, and the supposed danger of trusting power in the hands of Lord Shelburne, were the reasons publicly given for the necessity of forming the coalition: personal dislike of him, and a desire to be in power themselves, were in my judgment, the real ones. This dissension of the Whigs has done more injury to the constitution, than all the violent attacks on the liberty of the subject, which were subsequently made during Mr. Pitt's administration. The restriction of the liberty of the press, the long-continued suspension of the *habeas corpus* act, the sedition-bills, and other infringements of the

Bill of Rights, were, from the turbulent circumstances of the times, esteemed by many quite salutary and necessary measures: but the apostasy from principle in the coalition ministry ruined the confidence of the country, and left it without hope of soon seeing another respectable opposition on constitutional grounds; and it stamped on the hearts of millions an impression which will never be effaced, that *Patriotism is a scandalous game played by public men for private ends, and frequently little better than a selfish struggle for power.* This unfortunate, may it may not be called unprincipled, junction with Lord North, gave great offence to many of the warmest friends of the late Lord Rockingham, and, amongst others, to myself; and I made no scruple of expressing my opinion of it. This, as I expected, was taken very ill by my former friends. It is a principle with all parties to require from their adherents an implicit approbation of all their measures; my spirit was ever too high to submit to such a disgraceful bond of political connexion. I thought it, moreover, a duty which every

man, capable of forming a judgment, owed to himself and to his country, to divest himself of all party attachment in public transactions: the best partisans are men of great talents, without principle; or men of no talents, with a principle of implicit attachment to particular men. *To forget all benefits,* and to conceal the *remembrance* of *all injuries,* are maxims by which political men lose their honour, but make their fortunes.

The Whig part of the coalition ministry which was formed in April, 1783, forced themselves into the King's service. His Majesty had shown the greatest reluctance to treating with them. Their enemies said, and their adherents suspected, that if poverty had not pressed hard upon some of them, they would not, for the good of their country, have overlooked the indignities which had been shown them by the court; they would have declined accepting places, when they perfectly knew that their services were unacceptable to the King.

They did, however, accept; and on the

day they kissed hands I told Lord John Cavendish (who had reluctantly joined the coalition) that they had two things against them, the *Closet* and the *Country;* that the King hated them, and would take the first opportunity of turning them out; and that the coalition would make the country hate them. Lord John was aware of the opposition they would have from the closet, but he entertained no suspicion of the country being disgusted at the coalition. The event, however, of the general election, in which the Whig interest was almost every where unsuccessful, and Lord John himself turned out at York, proved that my foresight was well founded. It is a great happiness in our constitution, that when the aristocratic parties in the Houses of Parliament flagrantly deviate from principles of honour, in order to support their respective interests, there is integrity enough still remaining in the mass of the people, to counteract the mischief of such selfishness or ambition.

During the interval between Lord Shelburne's resignation and the appointment of

the Duke of Portland to the head of the Treasury, I published my letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury. I sent a copy to every Bishop, and of them all, the Bishop of Chester alone (Porteus) had the good manners so much as to acknowledge the receipt of it. I had foreseen this timidity of the bench, and I had foreseen also that he must be a great-minded minister indeed, who would bring forward a measure depriving him of his parliamentary influence over the spiritual lords: but I believed that what was right would take place at last, and I thought that by publishing the plan, it would stand a chance of being thoroughly discussed. Men's prejudices, I was sensible, could only be lessened by degrees; and I was firmly of opinion that *no change ought ever to be made in quiet times, till the utility of the change was generally acknowledged.*

Mr Cumberland published a pamphlet against me on this occasion; but he knew nothing of the subject, and misrepresented my design. He laid himself so open in

every page of his performance, that, could I have condescended to answer him, I should have made him sick of writing pamphlets for the rest of his life. Some other things were published by silly people, who would needs suppose that I was in heart a republican, and meant harm to the Church establishment. Dr. Cooke, Provost of King's College, was one of those few who saw the business in its proper light; he thanked me for having strengthened the Church for at least, he said, an hundred years, by my proposal.

I received many complimentary letters; the author of the following has been long dead, but it does such honour to his memory, that his surviving friends cannot but be gratified with a sight of it.

"My Lord,

"I HAVE been content hitherto to observe your progress in reputation and honours with a silent satisfaction. I was pleased with your answer to Mr. Gibbon, and entertained by your Chemical Essays, which

brought an abstract subject nearer to the level of such understandings as mine; and I sincerely rejoiced to hear of your advancement to the purple. Yet on these occasions I did not think myself warranted to break in upon you, either with my acknowledgements or felicitations. You owe the present trouble I give you to the recent publication of your Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury. I cannot resist the impulse which I feel to return you my thanks for this letter, especially for your defence of the second consequence (the independence of the Bishops in the House of Lords) of your plan, which in my opinion, entitles you to the thanks of every honest man in England. It is the privilege of your situation, my Lord, to speak words that will be heard in high places, and it cannot be indifferent to the community whether they be words of truth and soberness, or of self-interest and adulation. I have my fears, indeed,—my fears not for you, my Lord, but for my country,—that you will reap no other fruit from your proposal than the applause of the public, and

the approbation of your own heart. A contrary doctrine prevails, and is disseminated, with some caution indeed, but with much industry, even among the lower ranks of courtly politicians, so far as to reaching my ears,—the *doctrine of the necessity of corruption to our welfare*. I remember two or three years ago, to have seen a well-written Letter to Dr. Watson, under the character of a Country Curate, (it proceeded from the pensioned pen of Cumberland,) in which the writer pleasantly enough contends for some influence of the crown, to counteract the effect of republican principles, pride, envy, disappointment, and revenge. Unluckily, in a postscript to this letter, the cloven foot peeps out from under the cassock, and the writer has added to his opponents two others, wisdom and virtue. Suppose, says he, for a moment, (some, perhaps, may think it a violent supposition,) the members of the House of Commons to be all honest, intelligent, and uncorrupt; that no minister could prevail upon them by place, pension, or artifice; What is the consequence? Why the con-

stitution is overturned: that constitution which the wisdom and blood of our ancestors was exhausted in establishing; that is, which wisely established a balance to counterpoise the effects of wisdom and honesty, and provided an antidote against the poison of virtue. The writer may quibble, but I defy him to get fairly off from this consequence of his own words.

"A true description of the present system might, perhaps, be given in the words of an old Briton; which, though immediately applied to Roman tyranny, might, in a secondary sense, be considered as prophetic of a modern British House of Commons:—*Nata servituti mancipia semel veneunt, atque ultro a dominis aluntur: Britannia servitutem suam quotidie emit, quotidie pascit. Galgacus in Tacit.* But I have rambled too far, and must only add, that I am, with great truth and regard,

"Your Lordship's much obliged
and most obedient servant,
"S. DARBY."

"Ipswich, April 9th, 1783."

Mr. Darby was a most respectable character, highly esteemed by all who knew him for his integrity and ability, and had formerly been an eminent tutor in Jesus College, Cambridge. I sent him immediately the following answer:

"Dear Sir,

"I RETURN you a thousand thanks for your kind letter. The approbation of one good and liberal-minded man, is dearer to me than the highest honours of the church; the puff of lawn was never any object of my ambition; but I ever have been ambitious of being thought well of by men of virtue and understanding, and you must allow me to say, that in that light I am proud of your letter. I have great hopes that my plan will be effectuated, but I mean not to bring it forward till men's minds, the minds especially of the church dignitaries, are recovered from their idle apprehensions of danger from innovation.

"I am, &c.

"R. LANDAFF."

On the 30th of May, 1783, I made the following (my first) speech in parliament. The case was between the Bishop of London and Disney Fytche, Esq. on a writ of error from His Majesty's Court of King's Bench, brought by the bishop as plaintiff, who had refused to institute a clerk presented by the said Fytche, on account of the clerk having given a general bond of resignation. My speaking was unexpected by the bench, as I had not signified my intention either to the Bishop of London, or any other person:—

"My Lords,

"Though I am extremely sensible, how much it would become me to endeavour to bespeak your indulgence for the liberty which I am now taking, of delivering my sentiments on a subject that has already received so able and so ample a discussion from the learned judges, yet I hold Your Lordships' time to be much too precious to be consumed in listening to any preface or apology which I could make. I am the more imboldened to deliver my opinion on

this subject, from observing that the learned judges are not unanimous in theirs. Had they been perfectly united in sentiment, I should have had much greater scruple and hesitation in speaking than I now feel; yet, even in that case, I could not have suffered myself to remain altogether silent on such an occasion as this, when a question of great importance, both with respect to the interest of the Established Church, and the general interest of the Christian religion, is to receive the solemn and final adjudication of this House.

"The importance of this question, with respect to the Established Church, is evident enough from the effect which its decision may eventually have on its revenues: they may be very materially injured thereby. There is not, I am persuaded, one of Your Lordships who has duly weighed the civil and religious utility of an Established Church, and made himself sufficiently acquainted with the extent of the revenue appropriated to the support of our own, that can ever entertain a wish to see that revenue lessened.

" The proportion indeed, My Lords, in which the revenue of the church is distributed amongst the clergy, might, in my humble opinion, admit great improvement both in a religious and political light; but of whatever sentiments you may be on that head, I am certain that you will concur with me in thinking that the whole revenue when taken in the gross is not more than sufficient, if *sufficient,* for the maintenance of the establishment; it cannot without danger to the community admit of any diminution. But the legality of general bonds of resignation, if Your Lordships should adjudge them to be legal, will have a direct tendency to diminish the church revenue in a great degree. For no sooner shall the legality be generally known, than pettifoggers of the law, money-scriveners, land-surveyors, and all the simoniacal jobbers in ecclesiastical property, will conspire with needy patrons, and with more needy clerks, to invent and execute a thousand collusive plans to rob the church of a portion of that patrimony, which the pious wisdom of our ancestors annexed to it, and

which your piety and your wisdom, I trust, will never suffer to be dissevered from it.

"But the importance of this question may be considered in another and more momentous point of view, as it respects the purity of our religion. It is not for the security of the church revenue that we are in any degree solicitous, except so far as that security tends to render the clergy more fitted to discharge with fidelity the high duties of their sacred function.

"General bonds of resignation put the clergy who submit to them, into a state of dependence, awe, and apprehension, inconsistent with their stations as preachers of the Gospel. The pope in former times was a great encourager of resignations among the clergy of this country, because he obtained a year's income of the benefice upon every voidance; but neither were the Catholic clergy of this country at that time, nor are they I believe in any country, at this time, fettered by general bonds of resignation. In the Church of Scotland, (I speak under the correction of many noble Lords in this House, who certainly know

the matter much better than I do,) but, I believe that I am right in saying, that this unholy traffick in holy things has not yet polluted the minds of either patrons or ministers in the church of Scotland; nor is it practised in any Protestant church in Christendom, at least not in the same degree in which it is practised in our own.

"This traffick, My Lords, is a sore scandal to us; we are much grieved at it; and we hope from the high sense of religion and honour which this House has ever entertained, that it will be no longer endured. Even in the primitive ages of the Christian church, when it was not only unprotected by the civil power but persecuted by it; when kings, instead of being its nursing fathers, were its bitterest enemies, even then, when the clergy were maintained out of the eleemosynary collections which were made by every congregation of Christians every Lord's day, a minister of the Gospel was not in so precarious, dependent, and every way improper situation as the legality of general bonds of resignation will place him in; because his support did not

then depend upon the caprice of some one flagitious individual, who might be offended by the evangelical freedom of his preaching, but on the good sense of hundreds of well-disposed Christians, who felt themselves edified thereby.

" This, My Lords, is a very serious consideration. I do not wish, nor, I will take the liberty to say, is there a bishop on the bench who wishes to see the clergy rendered insolent by an accumulation of wealth and power; but we must all wish; for in this matter I am sure that I speak the sense of all my brethren; we must all of us ever wish to see them rendered so independent of all men, that they need not be afraid to tell any man of his sins; that they may reprove, rebuke, exhort, and preach the word of God with sincerity and truth, without shrinking from this part of their duty from an apprehension of being turned out of their benefices.

" The alienation of the church revenue, and the introduction of an accommodating, timid, temporising priesthood, are two great inconveniences, to call them by no harsher

appellation, which will attend the legality of general bonds of resignation.

"Here I shall probably be told, that I am guilty of a great solecism, in adducing the inconvenience attending general bonds of resignation as a proof of their illegality.— I am not, My Lords, so wholly ignorant of the first principles of reasoning as to make such a conclusion; I do not say that the inconvenience I have stated is a proof of the illegality of such bonds, but I do humbly think, that when the illegality is wholly questionable (as it confessedly is in the present case) the inconvenience may have, and will have, some weight in determining Your Lordships' judgment on the subject. Nay, I go further, and think, that though the inconvenience be not a direct proof of the illegality of these bonds, it is a presumption of it—for this presumption appears to me to be well founded, that, whatever is repugnant to the common interest, cannot be conformable to the common law of the land. But that general bonds of resignation are repugnant to the common interest of the kingdom is what some of the judges have strongly intimated in delivering their

opinions, and what few of Your Lordships I believe, were the matter a *res integra,* would scruple to affirm.

"I have heard but four reasons mentioned in proof of the utility of even specific bonds of resignation. One respects the binding the incumbent to a longer residence on his cure than the law requires; the second relates to the restraining him from the enjoyment of pluralities in cases allowed by the law. The third and fourth have reference to the convenience of private families in preventing a cession of livings by the acceptance of a bishopric, and in providing for sons or other connections when they came of age to hold livings.

"The first two reasons appear to be well founded in law; for it is lawful for a man to give a bond restrictive of his natural or civil liberty, provided that restriction be for a good purpose, for a purpose of public utility. But the legal validity of the other two reasons is not so obvious to my apprehension, for the purpose of the bond in either of the cases is not good; it is good for a particular family, but it is not good

for the community at large; and it is better that a particular family should sustain a little injury than that the community should suffer a great inconvenience. My Lords, I must correct this expression; I am incorrect, I think, in saying that private families would sustain an injury in having even special bonds of resignation adjudged to be illegal. There might according to our present notions of these things be some hardship, but there would be no injustice in the case; for it ought to be remembered that the *jus patronatus* is a spiritual trust, and should not be considered as a source of temporal benefit. When it was first granted to lords of manors and other laymen, who at their own expense built churches, there can be no doubt that they presented their clerks to the bishops not conditionally but absolutely, not for a term of years, or to resign at the request of the patron, but for life.

"But with respect to general bonds of resignation, the case now before the House, the matter, it is argued, is not now a *res integra*; since there have been in the course of two hundred years many ad-

judged cases, and we must, it is contended, of necessity adhere to the precedents.

"My Lords, the *stare decisis*, the *stare super antiquas vias*, are maxims of law sanctioned by such length of usage, and such an accumulation of authority, and so pressed upon our consideration at this time, that I dare not produce any of the arguments in opposition to them, which now suggest themselves to my mind, though some of them would go to question the utility, and some of them the justice of such maxims; they are maxims which my hitherto course of studies has not brought me much acquainted with. We do not admit them in philosophy, we do not admit them in theology, for we do not allow that there are any infallible interpreters of the Bible, which is our statute-book: on the contrary, we maintain that fathers, churches, and councils, have erred in their interpretation of this book, in their decisions concerning particular points of faith. This we must as Protestants ever maintain, or we cannot justify our having emancipated ourselves from the bondage of the church of Rome.

" But, be it so—let these maxims, as applied to the law, be admitted in their full extent, what follows? Nothing, My Lords, in this case; for the plaintiff asserts, and one of the judges has this day been pointed in proving, that the present case is not similar to any of the cases which have been adjudged in the courts below. Now a slight variation of circumstance vitiates the validity of a precedent, and it vitiates it upon good ground. The ground is this—that we cannot tell whether this variation of circumstance, had it been contemplated by the judge or the court which first established the precedent, would not have so operated as to have produced a different judgment. We are all sensible, when the mind is suspended as it were *in equilibrio* by an equal prevalence of opposite reasons, what a little matter will cause it to preponderate; and this little matter, by which any case differs from an adjudged case, lessens, if it does not overthrow the weight of a precedent.

" But let us suppose, though we do not grant it, that the cause of the plaintiff is similar in all its circumstances to some one

or more of the cases, which have been adjudged in the courts below, still it will not follow, that we are to be bound by these courts; if we are, the right of appeal is a nugatory business. Precedents may be obligatory in the courts in which they are established and they may there be useful in expediting processes, and in relieving the shoulders of the subject from that great but unavoidable burthen, the uncertainty of the law; but their operation should not be extended beyond the walls of those courts, it ought not at least to be extended to this House.

"If there were any precedents of Your Lordships having ever given judgment on the legality or illegality of general bonds of resignation, they would have great and proper weight in the case before us; but there are no such precedents. Whatever may be thought as to the novelty of the case in the courts below, it is undoubtedly new here, free and unshackled by precedent. Your Lordships' decision this day will establish a precedent which your posterity will revere and follow; I am persuaded, therefore, that you will give judgment on the legal merits of the question, as if it had never

been agitated and decided in the courts below.

" And here, My Lords, I am conscious of my inability, and acknowledge it with humility; I am not equal to the full legal investigation of the merits of this question. But as it is sometimes of use to know how the perusal of a statute strikes a plain unprofessional man, I will briefly state how the statute in question, I mean that passed in the twelfth of Queen Anne, and that in the thirty-first of Elizabeth, to prevent corrupt presentations to benefices, have struck me.

" I am sensible that the words *general* bonds of resignation are not to be found in either of these statutes; and if every thing that is not *totidem verbis* prohibited in an act of parliament, is to be considered as allowed in that act, then unquestionably general bonds of resignation must be legal; but let us consider the subject more generally.

" During the short time, My Lords, that I have had the honour of a seat in this House, I have heard many diffuse and elegant orations on different sides of the

same question, which have so bewildered my understanding, and perplexed my judgment, that I have not been able to come to any conclusion, till I divested the whole debate of all its ornament, and examined the matter by the dry rules of scholastic reasoning. Will Your Lordships allow me, instead of dilating on these statutes, to sum up what I would observe upon them in this dry way?

" A *syllogism*, I grant, is not a figure of rhetoric much used in this House, nor much calculated to conciliate your Lordships' attention; but it is a species of reasoning, which serves to compress much matter into a little compass, and helps to investigate truth with certainty.

" The syllogism which I would propound to the serious consideration of the House, is this:—That practice cannot be conformable to the spirit and meaning of an act of parliament, which entirely frustrates the very end and purpose, for the attainment of which the act was originally made.

" But general bonds of resignation entirely frustrate the very end and purpose

for the attainment of which both the acts in question were originally made. Therefore, general bonds of resignation cannot be conformable to the spirit and meaning of these statutes.

"How the practice of general bonds of resignation entirely frustrates the ends of these acts, will appear by a single instance. Suppose a living to be now vacant; the value of the next presentation to be 5000*l.*; the patron, by the thirty-first of Elizabeth, cannot sell this living; the clerk, by the twelfth of Queen Anne, cannot buy it; but by the magic of a general bond of resignation, both the patron and the clerk are freed from restraint. The clerk, in consequence of his bond, gets possession of the living which he could not purchase; and the patron, by suing the bond, gets possession of his money. Thus, in fact, the vacant benefice is virtually sold by the patron, and purchased by the clerk, and the legal end and purpose of both statutes is legally, if general bonds be legal, eluded and defeated. This is the manner in which the matter strikes me; yet I have some

doubt, whether I am not out of my depth; sometimes I think that I touch the ground, at other times I seem to myself to be afloat. The reason of my uncertainty is simply this;—I do not know in what degree we are in this House to be guided by the letter, and in what by the meaning and spirit of an act of parliament.

"I am not sufficiently acquainted with the doctrine concerning the legal latitude of the interpretation of statutes: leaving that point to be discussed by more able judges, I will proceed to trouble Your Lordships with an observation or two on the oath against simony, and on the form of resignation of benefices. I mean not, in what I shall say on these heads, to cast the slightest imputation on the character of the clerk in question. I know nothing of him, further than this transaction teaches; and I can conceive, that it was very possible for him to have thought, and I question not that he did think, that he was not engaged in an improper transaction.

"In the first place, My Lords, every clerk, before institution, swears that he has

not made any simoniacal contract, for or concerning the procuring his benefice. The force of this oath depends on the construction of the two terms, simoniacal contract. The term simony is a very complex term: it extends to more cases than have been enumerated in any law book; but thus much, I think, will be allowed on all hands, to be included in the idea of simony: Every pecuniary contract entered into by a clerk, by means of which he procures presentation to a vacant benefice, and without which he would not have procured presentation to it at all, is a simoniacal contract. A general bond of resignation is a pecuniary contract, by means of which the clerk procures presentation to a vacant benefice; and without which, he would not have procured presentation to it at all. Therefore, a general bond of resignation is a simoniacal contract. I protest I have not acuteness enough to see the fallacy of this conclusion.

"Here it may be remarked, with great apparent subtilty, that a bond to resign a benefice, is not a bond to procure a bene-

fice; and the idea may afford matter of ridicule to those who are disposed to perplex the argument. But ridicule is not the test of truth; it is a mere cobweb spread to entangle weak understandings; and I now do maintain, that though a bond to procure a benefice, and a bond to resign a benefice, be not in words the same, they are the same in purpose and effect. The cause of any effect is that, which being taken away, the effect itself would not take place. But the general bond of resignation is the *causa sine quâ non*, the very efficient cause of the presentation; for take away the bond, and there will be no presentation; therefore, the bond is a contract for procuring the benefice; it is the essential mean of procuring it, for the benefice could not have been procured without it.

" In the second place, I would beg for a moment Your Lordships' attention to the form of resignation of a benefice. In the old Latin form, (and the modern English is, or ought to be, a translation of it,) the clerk who tenders his resignation to the bishop, uses these words:—*Non vel metu*

coactus, vel sinistrâ aliquâ machinatione motus, sed ex spontaneâ voluntate purè ac simpliciter resigno et renuntio. Now, if there is any meaning in language, a clerk who has given a general bond of resignation cannot use this form. How is it possible that he can say, he is not *metu coactus,* when he is compelled by the terms of his bond; that he is not *sinistrâ aliquâ machinatione motus,* when he is impelled to the resignation by all the cogent machinery of the law; that he does it *ex spontaneâ voluntate purè ac simpliciter.* My Lords, there is no purity, no simplicity, no spontaneity in the case; or, if any, it is that kind of spontaneity which a man feels when he delivers his purse to a robber. No, the resignation does not proceed from the spontaneous, intrinsic movement of his mind, but from the compulsory extrinsic energy of his bond.

"I have detained Your Lordships too long. I have risen thus early in the debate, not from any expectation of my opinion having weight with any person but myself, but from a wish to form a right judgment; for I hope that some noble

Lord will condescend to inform me of the mistakes I may have committed in my reasoning, for, on so novel a subject, it is but too probable that I have committed many."

On my sitting down, Lord Sandwich said to me, you will carry your point. The judgment was reversed. *Pro*: Canterbury, York, Winchester, Chichester, Bath and Wells, Salisbury, Peterborough, Rochester, Worcester, Bangor, Lincoln, Gloucester, Llandaff, Sandwich, Radnor, Hillsborough, Thurlow, Bagot, Howe,—in all nineteen. *Con.*: Portland, Fitzwilliam, Mansfield, Loughborough, Stormont, Bathurst, King, Sandys, Abercorn, Sydney, Brownlow, Buckinghamshire, Ferrers, Walsingham, Richmond, Chedworth, Rawdon, Derby,—in all eighteen. Present in the House, but did not vote, Clarendon, Oxford, Willoughby, Harrowby.

If the legislature should ever think fit to pass an act of parliament, making *special* bonds of resignation legal, which might

perhaps be done with propriety, the oath of simony and the form of resignation must be altered.

I purposely alluded in this speech to what I had written respecting a better distribution of the Church revenue, to show the House that I persevered in my opinion, notwithstanding what had been published against it; and in the ensuing November, I sent a note to Lord John Cavendish, to the following purport:—

"I SHALL come to town at the meeting of parliament, and will take my chance some morning of obtaining an audience of ten minutes from Your Lordship, on the subject of the Ecclesiastical Reform. I am convinced of its utility, but I know how to rest contented with having fairly stated my sentiments, if the matter cannot be brought forward to advantage."

I called at Lord John's house several times, but never got admittance, nor did I ever receive a message from him, signifying his wish to see me on the subject; he was

probably of Lord Shelburne's mind, that the time was not *then*, for he was *then*, Chancellor of the Exchequer. Notwithstanding this, I always entertained a great respect for the honour and integrity of Lord John, and indeed for every branch of his illustrious house.

On the 4th of November (1783) I received a letter from the minister (Duke of Portland), desiring me to come up to town and to support Mr. Fox's East India Bill, which vested the patronage, &c. of that country in seven directors, to be nominated by the House of Commons. Though this measure was brought forward by a party which considered me as attached to them, and though I was a sincere enemy to the increasing influence of the Crown, yet, thinking that it was a great violation of the constitution, to transfer influence from the Crown to the friends of a minister in the House of Commons, I immediately sent the following answer; an answer, I knew, but ill calculated to promote my interest with the then administration:—

"Cambridge, Nov. 4, 1783.

"My Lord Duke,

"It is impossible for me who have, on all occasions, opposed the corrupting influence of the Crown, to support the measure, which is pregnant with more seeds of corruption than any one which has taken place since the revolution. This at least is the light in which it appears to me; I may have formed an erroneous judgment, but I cannot act in opposition to it. I had intended to have come to town and spoken against the bill, but I will not do that; I will for once so far distrust the solidity of my own reasoning on the subject, as not to oppose a measure which has the approbation of Your Grace, and of that part of the administration, of whose regard for the public good I can entertain no doubt.

"I am, &c.

"R. Landaff."

Mr. Fox had such enlarged views of constitutional politics, that at the time I sent this answer to the Duke of Portland, I hesitated on its propriety. But the pre-

servation of the King's prerogative from the encroachment of the House of Commons, even under a Whig minister, determined me.

On the 14th of the same month, I received an express from the Duke of Rutland, stating to me the King's opposition to the India Bill, the great probability of a change of administration, and many other motives, for my going to town; and ending with an earnest entreaty to see me next day in the House of Lords. I instantly returned the following answer:—

"My dear Lord Duke,

"The inclosed will show you that you have not been mistaken in your opinion of my principles; it is an answer to a pressing letter from the Duke of Portland; I send it to you in confidence; you will perceive from it that my word is gone to take no part in this business. I am sick of party. You are a young man, and zeal may become you, but I have lost my political zeal for ever; the *coalition has destroyed it.*

If a new administration is formed, it will be but a new coalition. Your political character is yet, in my opinion, unsullied; you are said, indeed, to be a deserter, but let it be remembered, that the Whigs first deserted their own honour when they joined Lord North.

"I am, &c.

"R. Landaff."

Mr. Fox's bill was thrown out by the Lords, and Mr. Pitt was soon after made First Lord of the Treasury. The King's interference in throwing out the bill could not be excused on constitutional principles, except by the attack which the Commons had made on the prerogative by passing the bill. If you will not admit the true principle of the constitution, which is the exercise of the King's negative, you in a manner compel him to the use of his influence over parliament, when he conceives either his prerogative to be attacked, or the safety of the country endangered, or even his caprices restrained by their proceedings. This mode of governing by influence, is a

dangerous and disgraceful mode; disgraceful to those over whom it is exerted, and dangerous to the common weal; inasmuch as it takes away all responsibility. When a minister can sanction every obnoxious measure by a vote of the House of Commons, he screens himself from all future censure, by making those who ought to be his accusers partakers of his misdemeanors.

Soon after this I went to London, and on calling on the Duke of Rutland I thought there was an unusual distance in his manner, not great enough to found a direct quarrel on, and yet too great for me to submit to, without assuming an equal distance on my part; this soon brought him to a little better temper. Lord Shelburne told me at the time, that he was afraid somebody had been endeavouring to make mischief between the Duke of Rutland and myself, on account of my not coming to oppose the India Bill. He did not tell me who the person was who had done me this injury, nor did my suspicion, till several

years afterwards, fall on Mr. Pitt; nor do I know whether it has fallen rightly at last. I hope it has not; for though I must ever consider it as a bad trait in Mr. Pitt's character that I never experienced from him the slightest return of *gratitude* for the services which I had rendered him, when he stood most in need of them at Cambridge; yet I am unwilling to think of him as having possessed a little and revengeful mind, stooping to injure those who would not become the blind instruments of his ambition. I gave Lord Shelburne to understand, that the Duke of Rutland might digest his displeasure as he could, for I would never utter a syllable in explanation or in excuse for my conduct on the occasion; that His Grace had experienced from me many and important instances of my regard, and that I was ready to give him more with respect to his private concerns; but as to my public conduct, I would ever assert to myself the right of private judgment, independent of all parties. This doctrine I could perceive was quite new to Lord Shelburne, and, in truth, few great men can relish it;

they want adherents, and they esteem no man who will not be their instrument. This plain dealing with men in power made many persons say that I knew not the world; they were mistaken; I knew it, but I despised it; I knew well enough that it was not the way to procure preferment; I remembered what I had learnt as a boy, the different effects of *obsequiousness* and of *truth*;

"Obsequium amicos, veritas odium parit;"

and I preferred, as a man, the latter. My friend the Bishop of Peterborough once said to me, "You are the most straight-forward man I ever met with." I was not displeased at his remark, for the rule of rectitude is but one, whilst the deviations from it may be infinite.

The Parliament was dissolved on the 25th of March, 1784. Mr. Pitt had, for several weeks previous to its dissolution, continued in office in direct opposition to the majority of the House of Commons. I looked upon this proceeding as establish-

ing a dangerous precedent; for though the House could not be justified in censuring a minister who had done no act that was censurable, yet it is to be dreaded that the precedent thus set, of continuing a minister in his place in opposition to a majority of the House of Commons, may hereafter be resorted to by the crown on occasions less justifiable. The numberless addresses, however, which were presented to the King against the coalition ministry, sufficiently shewed the sense of the nation to be with Mr. Pitt.

Now I consider the clear and decided voice of the people to be superior, not only to the House of Commons, but to the whole legislature; I hope, therefore, that no mischief will come to the constitution from this example. It was not so much the prerogative of the crown which kept Mr. Pitt in his place, and set the House of Commons at defiance, as it was the sense of the nation, which, on this occasion, was in direct contradiction to the sense of the House of Commons. I was at that time

very well acquainted with Mr. Pitt, and took the liberty to make known to him my sentiments in the following letter :—

"Cambridge, 12th May, 1784.

"Dear Sir,

"WILL you allow me to say, that I think you cannot continue minister with that high sense of honour which I wish you to do, whilst the resolutions of the last House of Commons, respecting you, stand unblotted from the Journals. You have now an opportunity of healing the wound, which many think you inflicted on the constitution, by remaining in power in opposition to the sense of the Commons, if you profess your readiness to retire; provided the new House of Representatives, which (from its being so recently elected) must be supposed to speak the voice of the people, should be of the same opinion relative to you that the last was. For it is a part of my political creed, that the voice of the people, whenever it can be clearly known, and I think it is clearly known to be with you, *is* and *ought* to be supreme in the state. I beg

THE TANJORE ... MAHAL

your pardon for the freedom with which I deliver my sentiments; you are indebted to the regard I have for your disinterestedness and integrity, and to the hope I have, that you may do real service to the country. that I trouble you with any opinion at all.

"I am, &c.

"R. LANDAFF."

I had mentioned to Mr. Pitt, a little time before, when he called upon me at Cambridge, on account of the election, this rescinding of the resolutions of the House of Commons, as the first business which ought to be brought forward in the new parliament; and he seemed at that time wholly to agree with me in the propriety of the measure; but he changed his mind, or was over-ruled by men more inclined to exalt the prerogative of the Crown, than to listen to the voice of the people, for nothing of the kind was ever mentioned in the House of Commons.

In a letter which I wrote to Mr. Pitt, in

July, 1784, amongst other political considerations was the following observation:— "I tremble for Ireland; it will be lost to this country, unless you give way to the popular disposition; it was what is called *firmness* which despoiled us of America: *it would immortalise your name, and the name of our friend, the Duke of Rutland, if you could accomplish, on an equal and liberal footing, an union of the two kingdoms.* Then would Britain and Ireland have but one interest; and it is rank absurdity in politics to expect any cordiality between them, whilst their interests are separate." Sixteen years after this, Mr. Pitt accomplished the union here recommended to his attention; but it was not attempted till a rebellion in Ireland, supported by a French invasion, had well nigh realised the fears I had entertained, of its being lost to this country: *nor was it at last accomplished in the liberal way it ought to have been done.*

Much about the same time I wrote to the Duke of Rutland, who was then Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland; the following ex-

tract from the Letter I then sent him, will show how strongly the necessity of an union had occupied my mind, and how much I wished to see it effected:—" Ireland, and every other distant part of our empire, has for many years been impoliticly considered, and oppressively treated, merely as a source of wealth to this country. My very heart is grieved at the idea of one nation being oppressed, that another may be rendered rich and luxurious. The government ought to pay an equal attention to the interests of all its component parts, and whether the lands and manufactures of Great Britain or Ireland are likely to be in the most flourishing condition, should never be a question, but how we may render them in both countries as flourishing as possible. I told Mr. Pitt, some time ago, that both your name and his would be immortalised, if an union between the two kingdoms on an equal and liberal footing could be established. Scotland has felt the advantages of an union; Ireland would feel the same in her turn, and instead of grinding the faces of the Poor Asiatics, to

make them pay the debts of Great Britain, we should become the most powerful nation in Europe, by relying on nothing but the FREE COMMERCE, and the full cultivation of the lands of the two islands."

Had the measure, recommended in my above letter to the Duke of Rutland, been at that time adopted, the state of the continent of Europe would either not have been what it now is, or we should have been better able to resist the storm which threatens us, than we now are. In twenty-two years Great Britain and Ireland would have become solidly united, and been so mutually strengthened by their cordial coalescence, that France, and all her tributary kings, might have excited our surprise, but not our apprehension.

The following is an extract of another letter to the Duke, in November, 1784, in answer to one of his, respecting the state of Ireland:—" I have nothing to object to any part of your reasoning respecting Ireland; it is all judicious and convincing;

and I particularly agree with you, with relation to the Catholics. No man upon earth, I trust, can have more enlarged sentiments of toleration than I have; but the Church of Rome is a *persecuting* church, and it is our interest and our duty, on every principle of religion and common sense, to guard ourselves against her machinations. There is far less danger to be apprehended by Protestants, in the present enlightened state of Europe, from the effects of Popery in those countries where it is the established religion, than in those where it is simply tolerated. The cabinets of Paris and Madrid would execrate the enormities which an infatuated populace in Ireland would perpetrate on the score of religion without remorse. Every indulgence, and even a participation of all civil rights might be granted with safety to the Catholics in England, because they are so far from being the majority, that they do not constitute one-seventieth part of the inhabitants. But in Ireland, the proportion between Catholics and Protestants being widely different, the whole conduct of govern-

ment should be different also. It is for want of seeing distinctions of this kind, that the patriots, some of whom are certainly well-meaning men, give you so much trouble. With respect to the commerce of Ireland, it ought to be as much encouraged as our own; and Ireland, in return, ought to contribute her full quota towards the maintenance of the fleets and armies, and the expenses of the civil list, by which government is supported, and the freedom and trade of both countries is protected. This is the only liberal maxim of government, by which a cordiality between the two kingdoms, can be secured on a permanent foundation." Though the union, and other circumstances, have somewhat changed the situation and the disposition of the bulk of the Irish Catholics; yet, till they are more emancipated from the power of their priests, or till the priests themselves have more enlarged notions of Christian charity, government must not be inattentive to them.

Mr. Wakefield published, in 1784, an

octavo volume, entitled, An Enquiry into the Opinions of the Christian Writers of the three first Centuries, concerning the Person of Christ, and thought fit to inscribe, in a very handsome manner, the publication to me. On the 25th of July, 1784, I sent him the subjoined reply:

"Sir,

"A VARIETY of business has prevented me for some time from reading your book, or I would sooner have thanked you for the honour you have done me, by inscribing your Enquiry to me. I admire and approve the spirit and erudition with which it is written; and though I think the pre-existence of Christ to be the doctrine of the New Testament, yet I am far from wishing the contrary opinion to be stifled, or the supporters of it to be branded as enemies to the Christian system.

"Whoever is afraid of submitting any question, civil or religious, to the test of free discussion, seems to me to be more in love with his own opinion, than with truth. I shall be glad to see you either in Cam-

bridge or in London, that I may become personally known to you. That the Spirit of God may guide you in all your researches, is the sincere prayer of

"Your much obliged servant,

"R. LANDAFF."

In December, 1784, I received a letter from Mr. Wyvil, (to whom I was not personally known,) informing me that Mr. Pitt had promised him to exert his whole power as a man and a minister, to bring about a reform in the representation of the people, and requesting me to use my influence in Cambridgeshire for the same end. I sent him by the return of post the following reply:—

"Sir,

"I THINK myself indebted to you for the honour of your letter yesterday, and take the earliest opportunity of expressing to you without reserve, my sentiments on the subject of it. Mr. Pitt's agreeing to support the measure of a parliamentary reform, as a man, pleases me very well, and

I believe him to be honourable and sincere in the declaration which he has made. But I am not pleased with his design of supporting it as a minister, for I am so great an enemy to influence over parliament, that I detest its exertion even in a cause which I approve; and in a cause of this consequence, if its success be not derived from the full conviction of those who are to decide on its merits, I think it ought not to be carried at all.

"The general question of parliamentary reform has my warmest wishes for a favourable issue to its discussion; *but I am not sanguine in my hopes of seeing much good resulting to the constitution from any mode of representation which I have yet heard of: nor am I able, though I have often speculated upon the subject, to devise any plan which I myself durst venture to propose, as likely to answer the end in view.*

"Nothing is wanting but a parliament, in which every individual would decide in the House of Commons, on the concerns of the nation, with the same impartiality that a juror decides in a court of justice on

the concerns of his fellow-citizens. But this impartiality can never be expected to take place, whilst there are such powerful weights as avarice and ambition, to draw men's judgments to one side. The mode of corruption may be changed, but corruption itself will remain, as long as there is so much public wealth to be distributed, and so many public honours to be disposed of, among the members of the House of Commons and their connexions.

"The manner of electing the members of the House of Commons, and the time for which they are to be elected, are subjects on which men's minds are much divided; I consider them as matters of importance, only so far as they contribute to the introduction of honest and independent members into the House, and to the keeping them so whilst they sit there. And hence I am not one of those who stickle for the abstract right of every individual having a vote in the election, nor for the ancient practice of having a new parliament elected every year, provided the integrity of parliament could be obtained by

other means. I freely own to you, that I fear this end will never be obtained to any salutary extent by any means. Other means, however, of doing all that is possible, may perhaps be thought of, less obnoxious to cavil and misconstruction, than either the extension of the right of voting to every individual, or the restriction of the duration of parliament to a single year.

"With respect to any influence, which I may be supposed to have, either in the university or county, it is too small to be mentioned, even if my situation would allow me to exert it with propriety, in the manner I did on a former occasion, when the calamity of the American war gave it an energy which it could not have now. I shall not, however, be backward in embracing any opportunity of signifying my intention to concur with those who, in a legal and peaceable way, shall, on this or any other future occasion, attempt to procure a reform of parliament.

"I am, &c.

"R. Landaff."

Since the writing of this letter, some unsuccessful attempts have been made in the House of Commons for procuring a better representation of the people, and there are many wise men who ardently wish for it, being fully aware, that without some effectual stop being put to the increasing influence of the executive over the legislative part of the constitution, the liberty of Britain must expire as that of Rome did; the forms of the constitution will remain, its substance will exist no more. And what hope can we have that a public body will reform itself? Since the miserable event of the French revolution, it may be said to every man in England and in Europe, who attempts to reform abuses either in Church or State—*Desine, jam conclamatum est.*

In March, 1785, I published a collection of Theological Tracts, in six volumes, closely printed on a large paper, principally intended for the benefit of young men who had not money to purchase books in divinity. This book was very well received by the world, near a thousand copies hav-

ing been sold in less than three months; and very ill received by the bishops, on account of my having printed some tracts originally written by Dissenters. Till I was told of it, I did not conceive that such bigotry could have been then found on the bench, and I trust it can be found there no longer. The Archbishop of Canterbury, to whom I sent a set, had never the good manners to acknowledge the receipt of the present; and the Archbishop of York objected to the collection being given by the associates of Dean Bray to a young divine, who was going out as chaplain to a nobleman in Canada. I was not at all mortified by this conduct of the two Archbishops, for I had but a poor opinion of the theological knowledge of either of Their Graces. I lived on good terms with them both; for I did not consider diversity of opinion, as any ground for disrespect towards men in their stations, which they filled not eminently, but inculpably.

But though this collection seems not to have been in the taste of the Archbishops, yet it went speedily through two large edi-

tions, and was held in such estimation, that Doctor Kippis, in his Life of Lardner (p. 44) says, "For the noble, manly, and truly evangelical preface by which it is preceded, its author is entitled to the gratitude of the Christian world." It is with peculiar pleasure that I mention the following anecdote:—Mr. Lambe was an eminent attorney in Cambridge, and in the latter part of his life, when I knew him, of a serious turn. His successor, in March, 1801, sent me the following account:—"Perhaps Your Lordship may not have heard, that the late Mr. Lambe bequeathed a great part of his property to a grandson of the author of "A Scheme of Scripture Divinity," which Your Lordship thought worthy of the first place in your collection of theological tracts."

The impartiality which I had used in putting into the catalogue of books in divinity, printed at the end of the collection of tracts, the works of dissenters as well as of churchmen, procured me the following letter from Dr. Harwood, to whom I was not personally known:

"My Lord,

"YESTERDAY I happened to take up, in a gentleman's house, Your Lordship's collection of Theological Tracts. Your selection does Your Lordship's candour and judgment great honour. I, who am an old man trembling on the brink of the grave with the palsy, could not but rejoice in my melancholy condition with Your Lordship's recommendation of my introduction to the study and knowledge of the New Testament, which I hope will be useful to young students in sacred literature when I am no more.

"It pours the greatest distinction on the moderation of the University of Cambridge, that this illustrious seminary hath deigned to recommend the reading of a book written by a poor dissenter, which had nothing for its object but displaying the truth and excellency of our common religion. But I was astonished to see in that useful catalogue of books which Your Lordship hath annexed to the last volume, *my five dissertations,* which completed my downfal among the bigots at Bristol. The second

dissertation, indeed, of the *Socinian scheme*, has some merit, which I republished, after it had pleased God in some measure to recover me from a dreadful stroke of the palsy, with which He was pleased to afflict me. Formerly Your Lordship's answer to Gibbon, and one of your sermons, gave me the highest idea of your abilities and judgment, and this collection of useful tracts hath confirmed it. The inferior clergy will peculiarly have great reason to bless Your Lordship, for whose use and improvement this publication is extremely well calculated. Permit me, My Lord, to thank you for the honourable and friendly mention you have made of my books.

"Your Lordship is correct in attributing "Plain Reasons for being a Christian" originally to my late father-in-law. It was written in conjunction with Dr. Hunt, who among the dissenters, on account of his skill in Hebrew, went by the name of Rabbi Hunt.

"I am, &c.

"EDWARD HARWOOD."

"**Hyde-street, Bloomsbury, March 27, 1785.**"

Doctor Harwood was a learned and a respectable man ; he died in 1794, and about a year before his death he published a letter in a valuable miscellany (Gentleman's Magazine, Nov. 1793, p. 994.) which he concludes in the following very remarkable manner : — " After expending a great deal of time in discussing, I am neither an Athanasian, Arian, or a Socinian, but die fully confirmed in the great doctrine of the New Testament, a resurrection, and a future state of eternal blessedness to all sincere penitents and good Christians."

The most undecided men on doubtful points, are those often who have bestowed most time in the investigation of them, whether the points respect divinity, jurisprudence, or policy. He who examines only one side of a question, and gives his judgment, gives it improperly, though he may be on the right side. But he who examines both sides, and after examination gives his assent to neither, may surely be pardoned this suspension of judgment, for it is safer to continue in doubt than to decide amiss.

To such men may well be applied what that most learned man Peter Daniel Huet says of himself, in his Philosophical Treatise concerning the Weakness of Human Understanding:—"If any man ask me "what I am, since I will be neither academic, nor sceptic, nor eclectic, nor of any "other sect; I answer that I am of my "own opinion, that is to say *free*, neither "submitting my mind to any authority, "nor approving of any thing but what "seems to me to come nearest the truth; "and if any man should, either ironically "or flatteringly, call us Ιδιαγνωμονας; that is, "men who stick only to their own senti-"ments, we shall never go about to hinder "it."

In the following July, I received a letter from the Duke of Rutland, in which he said, that though party in England had ably enough contrived to engender jealousies on constitutional points which were never intended to be affected, yet he was sure of carrying the commercial propositions which were then in agitation. I im-

mediately wrote to him to the following purport:—"I admire the liberal commercial system which you have adopted relative to Ireland, but unless the Irish think it beneficial to them, I should be very sorry to see it carried into execution. I speak not of the sentiments of a few interested men, or of a few disinterested but well-meaning men (for opposition of sentiments must ever be expected in great and complicated transactions), but of the bulk of the Irish nation. If they are clearly, however unadvisedly, against the measure, it would be bad and oppressive policy to force them, by your influence over parliament, to submit to it. My own opinion is, that this commercial union will be greatly advantageous to both countries, inasmuch as it will have, in some degree, the effect of a *legislative union,* and tend to do away the impolitic principle of considering their interests as diverse and incompatible. The language of some men in Ireland is proud and unwise. They contend for an absolute independence on Great Britain; let them have it; but let them not expect that the lands

of Great Britain should be mortgaged, to maintain a fleet for the protection of the coasts and commerce of Ireland; let them not expect, when they shall refuse to take our goods, that the trade of Great Britain into Germany and Russia, should still continue shackled in compliment to the linen-manufactory of Ireland."

On the 12th of August, 1785, the Irish government carried the question for leave to bring in a bill conformable to the propositions, which had been sent from England by a majority of nineteen, and three days afterwards they wisely abandoned the bill, declaring in the House, by Secretary Orde; that they would never again agitate the bill in the House of Commons, unless it was called for by the people and parliament of Ireland. Whilst this business was going forward in Ireland, I was at Harrowgate, making experiments on the sulphur-wells; I returned to Cambridge on the 27th of August, and the day after wrote to Mr. Pitt; the following is an extract of my letter:— "If I durst presume to hint an opinion in

the present circumstances, I would say with respect to Ireland, Do nothing. It was necessary a year ago that something should be attempted, but it is not necessary now that any thing more should be attempted at present. What has been done will convince a large party in Ireland of the good intentions of our government towards them; and, on any emergency hostile to the connexion which ought to subsist between the two kingdoms, this party will shew itself, and increase in numbers and in strength.

"Ireland may, perhaps, proceed to advance her consequence by regulations in trade. These must be watched; and every one which has a direct tendency to injure the trade of Great Britain must be opposed; not directly by endeavouring to stem the popular current of the Parliament of Ireland, but by counter regulations of our own trade, by our own Parliament.

"Ireland has refused to become a great people in conjunction with us; let her try to rise superior to her present difficulties; I do not say without our good wishes, but without our rendering her any assistance

which may interfere with our own security. It is but common sense in us, to use this precaution. If the Irish will not form a constituent part of the same empire with ourselves, (for the having the same King does not put them in that predicament); if they will not have the same enemies, the same friends, the same commercial arrangements, and a common purse for the support of a common government, it is our business not to abandon, in any one circumstance, for their emolument, the advantages which we are in possession of—from our capital, as a trading, and from our industry and ingenuity, as a manufacturing nation.

"Let us bear the Irish no ill will; but let us take care of ourselves, till they shew a disposition more favourable to a *legislative*, at least to a commercial union with us, than they have done in the haughtiness and suspicion of their present politics.

"I wish there was justice and moderation enough among the leading powers of Europe, to let Ireland lift up her head as an absolutely independent state; but she will soon find, that she is more indebted for her

liberty to the jealousies of other states, than to the vigour of her own exertions.

"Were I an Irishman of the greatest property in the country, I should think that property to be better secured, and more likely to be augmented, by a real and solid union with Great Britain, than by any other mean whatever: and the time will come, (*would to God it may come without previous confusion and calamity!*) when Ireland will be of the same opinion."

The prediction here expressed, has been verified, but not without previous calamity.

On the 11th of January, 1786, I was sent for by express, to my friend Mr. Luther, in Essex. I found him, as was thought by Sir Richard Jebb and his other physician, so much out of danger, that they both left him the next morning. In the course of a few hours after they were gone, a stoppage of urine came on; I immediately sent to town for Mr. Pott; who not being at home, his son-in-law, Mr. Earle, came down to

Myles's, and on using the catheter, he found that a mortification had taken place in the neck of the bladder, and that there were no hopes: my poor friend died on the 13th, in the morning. On opening the will, I was found to be sole executor. His Essex estate was left to his younger nephew, Francis Fane, Esq., in strict entail to some other of his relations, with the remainder to me. His Sussex estate was left to me and my heirs, charged with a legacy of three thousand pounds. I sold this estate in the following July, to Lord Egremont, for twenty-three thousand five hundred pounds.

The expense and manner of the funeral was ordered by the will to be at my discretion; his two nephews, Lord Howard, and some of the principal gentry of the country, with his tenantry, attended the funeral, and I read the service as well as I could myself—as well as I could, for I was more than once obliged to stop: we had lived as brothers for thirty years. I had ever a strong affection for him; and his for

me was fully manifested by his will, which was made many years before he died. When he was at the point of death, my heart was overpowered. I knelt down in a corner of his bedchamber, and with as much humility and as much sincerity as I ever used in prayer for myself, I interceded with the Father of Mercies for pardon of my friend's transgressions. I knew perfectly well all the philosophical arguments which could be used against the efficacy of all human intercession; and I was fully conscious of my own unworthiness and unfitness, with so many sins of my own to answer for, to intercede for others; but the most distant hope of being of use to my expiring friend overcame all my scruples. If we meet in another world, he will thank me for this instance of my love for him, when he was insensible to every earthly concern, and when I was wholly ignorant of the purport of his will.

I have managed as I ought to have done this legacy. It has enabled me to preserve my independence, and to provide for my

family. I have a thousand times thought, that had I been a mean spirited, time-serving bishop, I might perhaps have escaped that marked and unmerited neglect of the Court, which I have for so many years experienced, but that I should certainly have forfeited the affection of my friend; his upright and honourable principles would never have suffered him to distinguish such a character with that eminent token of his regard which he bequeathed to me.

I had published a third volume of Chemical Essays in 1782, and in February, 1786, I published a fourth, and then burned a great many chemical manuscripts which I had written at sundry times whilst I was Professor of Chemistry. They consisted of many interesting dissertations, which only wanted a careful revision to have been produced with credit to the world, such as those concerning Blood, Milk, Urine, Fermentation, Wine, Ale, Vinegar, Putrefaction, Sugar, Balsams, Resins, Glass, precious Stones, Metallic Substances, &c., in

all of which I had united the natural and commercial history with the chemical analysis of the substances, and had introduced what the ancients knew on these subjects. I cultivated chemistry from 1764 to 1771, with laborious and unceasing assiduity, and derived more pleasure and knowledge from the pursuit of that, than of any other branch of philosophy in which I was ever engaged.

Whilst I was Professor of Chemistry, I dissected a subject which I had procured from London, in order to perfect myself in Anatomy; my laboratory was my theatre, and Professor Waring, known to Europe by his mathematical publications, and my old friend Preston (afterwards Bishop of Ferns), were my assistants. When we had finished the business we put what remained of the body into a box, and commissioned an old soldier to bury it in the fields. The man thought the box was worth something, and instead of burying it he opened it, and poured the contents into the Cam, and as there happened then to be a great flood,

some of them were drifted on shore and excited a great suspicion of murder having been committed; but as no person was either taken up or suspected of it, we carefully kept our secret, and thus probably escaped being stoned, like anatomists of old, by a superstitious populace.

On the 2d of August, 1786, an insane woman, named Margaret Nicholson, attempted to stab the King as he alighted from his carriage. Upon an intimation from the Archbishop of Canterbury, addresses were presented from the several Dioceses. I drew up the following for mine.

"Most Gracious Sovereign,

"WE, the Bishop, the Archdeacon, and Chapter, and the clergy of the diocese of Landaff, Your Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, humbly entreat Your Majesty graciously to accept our faithful congratulations on the protection, which the good providence of God has lately vouchsafed to Your Majesty, from the attack of an insane assassin.

" The mildness of Your Majesty's government, united with the exemplary probity and condescension of your private life, have left Your Majesty no deliberate enemies, no apprehension of any danger from the malice of any of your subjects. In the late calamitous event, Your Majesty will feel a comfort which is fully felt by all your people, from knowing that the hand of violence was not aimed against Your Majesty's life by the spirit of public faction, or private discontent. The worst of kings, in every age and country, have been encouraged by adulatory addresses of flagitious men, to persevere in modes of government destructive of the freedom and felicity of mankind. Sincerity and truth have been, in this way, so often sacrificed on the altar of private interest, as almost to render suspicious the professions of honest men, on the fairest occasions; yet on this occasion we fear not the being accused of flattery and insincerity, when we avow in the face of the world, that we believe there is not a single person in Your Majesty's dominions, who will not join with us in

thanking God for this instance of his goodness towards you, and in praying that He will long continue to us the happiness, and the liberty, civil and religious, which we enjoy under Your Majesty's government."

I saw Lord Lansdown soon after the presenting this address, and he thanked me for it, saying that it had done him credit; but that Bishop Shipley's address had done him disservice in a certain place. His Lordship looked upon himself as connected with the Bishop of St. Asaph and myself, and indeed he had a right to do so; for he had made me a bishop, and he had asked for the Archbishoprick of Canterbury for Shipley, on the death of Cornwallis; but I do not believe that we either of us thought of him when we drew up our respective addresses.

About this time application was made to me by government, to know whether I could give any advice relative to the improvement of the strength of gunpowder; and I suggested to them the making char-

coal by distilling the wood in close vessels. The suggestion was put in execution at Hythe, in 1787, and the improvement has exceeded my utmost expectation. Major-General Congreve delivered to me a paper, containing an account of the experiments which had been made with the cylinder powder, (so called from the wood being distilled in iron cylinders,) in all of which its superiority over every other species of powder was sufficiently established. In particular, a given quantity of gunpowder, made with this kind of charcoal, threw a ball of sixty-eight pounds weight two hundred and seventy-three feet; whilst the same mortar, at an equal elevation, and charged with an equal weight of gunpowder made with charcoal prepared in the best of the ordinary ways, threw an equal ball only one hundred and seventy-two feet. In this experiment, the strength of the cylinder, estimated by the horizontal range, is to that of the best sort of other powder, as 100 to 63. By experiments with the Eprouvette, the proportion of the strength of the cylinder to other powder

was that of 100 : 54. In round numbers, it may perhaps be near enough to the truth to say, that the strength of the cylinder powder is to that of other powder, as 100 : 60, or 5 : 3. One of the clerks in the laboratory at Woolwich desired a gentleman, in 1803, to inform me, (as he suspected I did not know it,) that I had for several years saved to the government one hundred thousand pounds a year. I have never inquired whether this information is correct; nor if it should turn out to be so, have I any intention of applying for a reward. My country is welcome to my services in every way; but if, in the vicissitudes incident to all families, my posterity should be by misfortune, not occasioned by vice or indiscretion, reduced to beggary, I would advise them to petition the House of Commons for a remuneration; they may do it with a just confidence of being listened to. At a levee, soon after the experiments on gunpowder had been made, I happened to be standing next to the Duke of Richmond, then Master General of the Ordnance, and the duke informed His

Majesty, that they were indebted to me for a great improvement in its fabrication. On my saying that I ought to be ashamed of myself, inasmuch as it was a scandal in a Christian Bishop to instruct men in the mode of destroying mankind, the King answered, " Let not that afflict your conscience, for the quicker the conflict, the less the slaughter," or in words to that effect. I mention this to do justice to the King, whose understanding it was the fashion to decry. In all the conversations I had with him, he appeared to me not to be at all deficient in quickness or intelligence.

In September, 1786, I wrote to the Duke of Rutland, to the following effect:

" The White Boys, I understand, give you trouble about tithes. I know nothing concerning the nature of their claims, but I will state to you my abstract notion of the subject. It is of use to bear in mind the true principles of legislation, though it may not be always expedient to practise them.

The clergy are hired by the state, and they are paid by tithes. When these tithes were first granted, there was but one sect of Christians, the Catholics. Whether the mode of paying the clergy, which was then established, was the best which could have been thought of, has been doubted by many. I think there was none preferable to it at that time; when all men were of the same religion, and when that religion had some hold on men's minds. The case is now much changed in both these points; a variety of sects have sprung up in England and Ireland, and religion itself is not so highly esteemed as it was formerly. Most men of fortune care little about religion, and they grudge the clergy what is due to them, by laws which were made long before they or any of their ancestors possessed the estates, which are now saddled with the incumbrance of tithes.

"It does not become any legislature to give way, on principles of equity, to the demands of these men: they are as evidently founded on avarice and injustice as if all the copyholders in the kingdom were

to demand an exemption from the payment of the lords' rents, to which their estates have for many centuries been subject. But, on principles of utility, it may be expedient to sooth their prejudices, if their combination is a powerful one, by listening to any change which they may propose in the mode of paying the clergy; provided the change be grounded on a principle, which they will not readily admit, that the clergy be not plundered, and that the gentlemen who propose the change be not benefited by the plunder.

"The other point, which respects the payment made by sectaries, has more difficulty in it; and it becomes perplexed indeed, when a great majority of a country is not of that sect which is established by government. The just principle is this: every man should contribute his due proportion to the maintenance of the ministers of religion, (for no state can subsist without some religion,) and a Christian state should allow a co-establishment of the different sects of Christians; that each individual might have an opportunity of frequenting

his own place of worship, without being burdened by any additional payment to his own minister, exclusive of what he paid to the minister established by the state.

"This co-establishment cannot, probably, take place in countries, which have been long accustomed to patronise one particular mode of worship, with a simple toleration of others; nor is there any injustice in its not taking place, whilst the majority of the persons of property in the country are of opinion, that it is more for the interests of the state to support one sect exclusively, than to support all sects promiscuously. The dissenters in England constitute, it has been said, a fourth part of the whole community; but they do not possess, I think, a fiftieth part of the property of the whole kingdom. Whether it would be advantageous to the state, that their ministers should be paid by the state, is a question on which I have had no occasion to form an opinion; but I am clear in this, that they suffer no injustice in paying tithes, because the lands, out of which the tithes issue, were subject to that payment ages

before the name of a dissenter was heard of. They may as justly be compelled (not to frequent a place of worship which they dislike, that is quite another thing) to pay towards a religious establishment which they dislike, as Your Grace and I, and many other good Whigs, were compelled to contribute to the support of the American war, which we reprobated from the first as impolitic and unjust. The minority in all such cases is rightly concluded by the majority.

"I do not believe that the next session of Parliament will pass as easily as the last has done. The country gentlemen think that they are not treated with sufficient respect, and I wish there be no mischief brewing from other quarters. I neither am nor desire to be in the secret, but I can see a little into futurity as well as other men; and, without looking into futurity, I see some things which I do not like. I told you when I would not come up to vote against Mr. Fox's India Bill, out of regard to a part of the then administration, *that a new ministry would be but a new coalition.* I think I then said nothing amiss, for *Charles*

Jenkinson is *become Lord Hawkesbury* ! ! !—
In my attachment to yourself,
"I am your unalterably
affectionate friend,
"R. LANDAFF."

I will put down the Duke's answer to this letter; not because it contains a compliment to myself, but because it shews how earnest he was in whatever he thought respected the public good, and how forcibly he both thought and wrote, far beyond the conceptions of those who knew him not.

"Phœnix Park, Oct. 7, 1786.

"My dear Lord,

"I HAVE to return you my best thanks for the trouble you have given yourself to go into the question of the disturbances which have for some time agitated the province of Munster, but which appear now to be nearly, if not *in toto*, happily subsided. I do not, however, think you place the subject in dispute on the precise point of ground, on which it should stand, because you have not the exact premises to argue upon. But as, without flattery, no

man's opinions on all subjects is more weighty with me than yours, and especially in a matter of this nature, I will have the whole cause of dispute accurately drawn up for your consideration, where you will see the grievances complained of, which, in a degree, are founded, but which it is difficult to redress without endangering what must be supported; and at the same time it is impossible to suffer the country from time to time to be involved in a state little short of war. I have this other consideration in sending you the papers I allude to; it will afford matter for our future correspondence. I have no apprehension about the strength of government in either country; and I trust you will find the daily increase of the funds, which I verily believe to be permanent, and without art, together with a solid extension of commerce, and the opening new channels for our manufactures, to be weapons in the hand of the minister by which he will beat down all before him. As for the accession of Jenkinson, I do not consider it in the odious light of a coali-

tion; he is brought forward into a particular line of office, to preside over the commerce of the country, for which he is the best qualified of any man in the kingdom. His *price was a peerage*, and, as Fox said on the India Bill, when they gave salaries to Lord Fitzwilliam, &c., "Men will serve better if they be paid according to their wishes;" so whether his object be honour, emolument, or both, it matters but little, if you obtain the best man for the particular line in which you wish to employ him. I am persuaded you will never find Tory principles pervading the system pursued by the present administration. At all events the coalition, if such it be, is a very different one from that which was the *caput horum et causa malorum*.

"Believe me to be ever

"Your affectionate friend,

"RUTLAND."

I did not receive any further information from His Grace relative to the disturbances in Ireland, till the month of January, 1787, and then he sent me two pamphlets,

and I immediately wrote to him the following letter in reply.

"My dear Lord Duke,

"I THANK Your Grace for the two pamphlets. I have read them twice over; and the main thing I have learned from them is, that your disturbances are occasioned by the Catholic Farmers. The only matter which excites my surprise is the shortsightedness of the Protestant possessors of land. They are infatuated by avaricious expectations, or they would to a man have insisted on their tenants paying punctually the fair amount of their tithes to the clergy. They are desirous to pay no tithes for their lands; the event may be, that they will have no lands to pay for.

"That the *Catholics* should be unwilling to pay the tithe of their labour, or other property, for the maintenance of a *Protestant* clergy is, in the nature of things, to be expected; and, as Popery is the religion of a great majority of the state, in strict justice it ought to be the established religion of the country. In other words,

the revenue raised by the authority of the state from all its subjects, for the express purpose of instructing all in religion, is unjustly expended in the instruction of a small part of the whole.

"This observation cannot be obviated by saying, that every man ought to be of the religion of the state; for every man ought to obey, not government, but his conscience, in his mode of worshipping God. This would be the plain truth of the case, and government would be guilty of evident injustice towards the Catholics, provided the religious tenets of the Catholics were unmixed with political principles adverse to the civil constitution of the state. But as there have been since the Reformation many proofs, both in England and Ireland, of a contrary disposition in the Catholics, it may be thought proper that the abstract right of the Catholics should, in this instance, give way in Ireland to the public safety. And yet I own I do not like the doctrine of any government compelling its members to submit to injustice; for this is the very doctrine which lost us America.

"But on the supposition, that no relief can be *safely* granted to the Catholics, the hand of government should be extended with decided force, to the protection of the Protestants in all their rights; the insurgents should be speedily and effectually subdued. No man will suspect me of a want of toleration in religious matters; yet I own I have looked upon the concessions which have been made to the Catholics, both here and in Ireland, with a jealous eye; and I shall ever continue to think that Protestant government is unwise which trusts power to the Catholics, till it shall be clearly proved, that if they had the opportunity they would not use it to the oppression of the Protestants. There are some enlightened gentlemen among the Catholics; but the persecuting spirit of the Roman Church remains in the hearts of the generality of its members; and whilst it does remain, Popery must be watched, intimidated, restrained. Is it an impossible stroke of policy to attach the bishops and clergy of the Papists to the state, by making it their interest to be faithful and

peaceable subjects? A *Regium Donum* of forty or fifty thousand a year would have a great effect.

"I will not enlarge on this hint, because at this distance I cannot judge of its practicability.

"I am told that in many parts of Ireland there are no Parsonage houses: (this is true also of England, and the same remedy might be applied:) in such places the livings, when they become vacant, should be *sequestered* for two or three years, and the moneys thence arising should be applied to the erection of houses in which the ministers might reside; or some other plan should be thought of for building them fit habitations, and *residence should then be enforced;* for nothing tends more to civilise a country than a resident clergy.

"You have a difficult part to act. The Catholics, were they faithful subjects, would have a clear right to complain of oppression; and they will not admit that they are not faithful subjects; nor will it be the interest of government to irritate them, by showing a suspicion of their fidelity. The

best mode of conduct is, in my judgment, to punish with rigour all breaches of the peace, and, if the civil power is insufficient for the execution of the civil laws, to use the military; for there is an end of government when the laws cannot be executed. I abhor the use of the military in all cases where a due deference is paid to the laws; but when numbers of men obstruct the regular course of law, and overpower the ordinary officers of justice, it is right to introduce and to use, as long as the necessity of the case requires it, extraordinary ones.

"All this, however, goes on the supposition, that no redress can be granted to the Catholics, consistently with the safety of the state.

"I am, &c.

"R. LANDAFF."

A day or two after I had sent to him the preceding letter, I wrote to him the following, which finished the political advice I gave to the Duke of Rutland, whilst he

was in Ireland; at least, if there were any other letters, I kept no copies of them:—

"My dear Lord Duke,

"In my last, I said nothing to Your Grace on the commutation of tithes, and yet it is probable that the subject may be agitated in your Parliament; I will therefore, in as few words as I can, state what I think just, and perhaps expedient, on that head.

"I am a friend to a commutation, because I am a friend to charity and good neighbourhood; I wish the commutation to be in land, because I would have the means of the clergy certain, and not dependent on the fluctuation in the value of money. The cry against tithes has not arisen from any extortion of the clergy, either in this kingdom or in Ireland; but it does now subsist in both countries, and it obstructs in both the Christian utility of the ministry, and on that account I wish to see the occasion of such obstruction removed.

"The quantity of land which should be

THE TANJORE MAHAL

given in exchange I pretend not to ascertain. The clergy must be contented, in the present temper of the Irish, with what they can get; yet it ought to be so liberal a commutation, as will enable every parson to live creditably and hospitably in the midst of his parishioners. A proper provision being made for every minister, his residence should be made an *absolute condition* of his receiving it.

"Pluralities and non-residence are scandals in the Christian church, as a church, and injurious to those interests of the state, for the promotion of which it is at the expense of maintaining a clergy.

"One thing I beg to recommend to you, and it is an act of only pure justice—that none of the present clergy be compelled to accept the commutation. If an act is passed, let it take place, either in such cases as the present incumbents shall of themselves desire, or as they shall severally die. There is no injustice in altering either the value of the benefice, or the mode of raising that value, when the property of the benefice

reverts as it were to the state on the death of an incumbent; but there would be injustice in compelling the present incumbent of any church to accede to a change of property which he disliked.

"I am, &c.

"R. LANDAFF."

The disorder which had attacked me in 1781, still continued with great violence, and rendered the discharge of my duty, as Professor of Divinity, to the last degree irksome to my feelings, and dangerous to my existence. Three years before this time, I had intimated to Mr. Pitt my wishes for any piece of preferment which would enable me to resign my professorship; for even with it I was worse provided for than any of my brethren, and without it I should have had a church income of only about twelve hundred a-year. It went very much against me to renew my application to Mr. Pitt; but I was concerned not only for myself, but for the honour of the University, which ought

never to have a deputy in the theological chair, and I foresaw that I could not long continue to do the duty of it. On the death, therefore, of the Bishop of Durham, I wrote to Mr. Pitt, not for that bishoprick, but merely expressing a general hope, that some arrangement might take place which would permit me, without ruining my family, to resign my professorship. In a few days Mr. Pitt sent the following answer to my application.

"Downing-street, Jan. 23, 1787.

"My dear Lord,

"I WAS honoured with Your Lordship's letter, which the engagements of the time prevented me from being sooner able to answer. I should on many accounts have been happy if I could have been instrumental in promoting Your Lordship's wishes, but various circumstances on the present occasion put it out of my power.

"I have the honour to be, my dear Lord,

"Your most obedient
and faithful servant,

"W. PITT."

I sent an answer to this letter in the following words ;—

"Great George-street, Jan. 24, 1787.

"My dear Sir,

"It is not for me to enquire what circumstances prevented you from promoting my wishes ; I am desirous of believing that they were of a weighty nature, for I am more hurt at my not having an occasion of considering Mr. Pitt as my private friend, than I am at his neglect of me as a minister. I must call it, in my present ignorance of circumstances, neglect; for there were various ways in which my wishes might have been gratified. They were not founded in avarice; they extended not so much to an increase of income as to a change of situation ; and that I consider as a favour, which a life spent, and a constitution impaired, in the discharge of the most difficult offices of an University, entitled me to expect from any minister.

"I am, &c.

"R. L."

I knew that this letter would offend the high spirit of Mr. Pitt, but mine was as high as his own; and I disdained concealing my chagrin at being passed by without notice, when extreme bad health, which I had long laboured under, joined to the consideration of my having, on many occasions, been serviceable to Mr. Pitt; of my having been fifteen years Professor of Divinity, seven years Professor of Chemistry, four years Moderator in the University, and I know not how many years Private Tutor, Assistant Tutor, Head Tutor, in Trinity College; gave me a reasonable confidence, that the wishes which I had so long before expressed to Mr. Pitt, would, on this occasion, have been attended to. Whether they ought to have been attended to or not, let posterity judge.

On the 10th of February following, a meeting of the Bishops was convened at the Bounty-Office, on a summons from the Archbishop of Canterbury, and at the instance, as we were given to understand, of Mr. Pitt, who wanted to know the senti-

ments of the Bench relative to the repeal of the *Test* and *Corporation* Acts. The question proposed at the meeting was put thus :—" Ought the Test and Corporation Acts to be maintained ?" I was the junior bishop, and as such, was called upon to deliver my opinion first, which I did in the negative. The only bishop who voted with me was Bishop Shipley. The then Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Bishops of Worcester, Lincoln, Ely, Peterborough, Norwich, Exeter, Bangor, Bath and Wells, Rochester, and Lichfield, voted that the Acts ought to be maintained. When the question was thus decided, that my brethren might see I was not sorry to be known to have voted as I had done, I moved, that not only the result of the meeting, but that the names of those who had voted for and against the maintenance of the Acts, should be sent to Mr. Pitt; and the motion was passed unanimously.

The question for the Repeal of the Acts was then lost in the Commons, by a majority of 78 — 178 : 100. It was again

brought forward in 1789, and was again lost by a majority of 20—122 : 102. This small majority encouraged the Dissenters to bring it forward again in 1790; but the cry of the *Church's danger* began to be raised, and meetings were held by some alarmed clergymen, principally in the dioceses of York and Chester, and the question was lost by a majority of 194—299 : 105. In a conversation I then had with Lord Camden, President of the Council, I plainly asked him if he foresaw any danger likely to result to the church establishment, from the repeal of the Test Act: he answered at once, none whatever. On my urging the policy of conciliating the Dissenters, by granting their petition, his answer made a great impression on my mind, as it showed the principle on which great statesmen sometimes condescend to act. It was this:—*Pitt was wrong in refusing the former application of the Dissenters, but he must be now supported.*

The cause of the Dissenters was much injured, by some indiscreet expressions of

Dr. Priestley, relative to the approaching fall of all civil and ecclesiastical establishments; though, justly speaking, Dr. Hartley, I think, was more answerable for such an opinion than Dr. Priestley, who had probably adopted it from the writings of the former. Dr. Hartley's famous book, entitled, "Observations on Man, his Frame, his Duty, and his Expectations," was first published in 1749. The eighty-first proposition of that book, says, "It is probable, that all the civil governments will be overturned;" and the eighty-second says, "It is probable, that the present forms of church government will be dissolved." Both these propositions are grounded on the interpretation of certain prophecies; but these prophecies are neither so distinctly set forth, nor so indubitably explained by Dr. Hartley, as to induce a cool-headed man implicitly to adopt them; though the fall of the French monarchy and church drew some men's attention towards them about that time. I have an anecdote concerning these two propositions worth mentioning; it was told me by Lady

Charlotte Wentworth. She happened to be attending her father at Bath when this book was first published, and being much alarmed at what she had read in it, relative to the fall of governments and of churches, she asked Dr. Hartley, on his next visit to her father, whom he attended as his physician, when these terrible things would happen. He answered, "I am an old man, and shall not live to see them; but you are a young woman, and probably will see them:" and more persons than her Ladyship thought, that the French revolution was the beginning of the completion of Dr. Hartley's prediction.

In a few weeks after the failure of the motion for the repeal of the Test Act, in 1787, Mr. Pitt's Commercial Treaty with France was brought forward. I had expressed my disapprobation of it publicly, for several months before, to all my friends; but the part I took against it was attributed, by the ministerial writers, to the resentment I had conceived against the minister, for his neglect of me. That would not

have been (in the present state of public principle amongst us) an improbable reason; but the real fact was, that long before it was brought into the House of Commons, I had expressed my dislike of the treaty, principally from an apprehension, that a free commercial intercourse between the two nations would give the French an opportunity of adopting all our machinery, and of discovering our manufacturing secrets, on which I knew that much of our success in trade depended. To give a single instance of this: hundreds of waggon loads of Birmingham goods have been sold in Germany, and in other parts of the Continent, from stirring a pot of melted brass with an hedge-stake, which would not have been saleable at all had the pot been stirred with an iron instrument. I spoke twice against the treaty; one of the speeches is reported in Debrett's Parliamentary Register, but I have no memorial of the other, except a general kind of recollection, that it was employed in proving, that in our trade with all the world, there had been, on an average of the last fifty

years, a balance in our favour of two millions a year, and that I thought it impolitic to risk the permanence of such prosperity, by entering into a commercial treaty with France, which might aggrandise our enemy, and ruin our ally in Holland. I then added, as a kind of prophecy, *If France shall ever, by force or by fraud, unite the marine of Holland to her own, there will be an end of our history as a great people! Falsus sim vates!*

The opposition, on this occasion, paid me great attention, till I told them that they must not consider me as joining their party; that I approved of and should support Mr. Pitt, but that on questions of great importance, I never would be attached to any party.

I saw the Chancellor, (Thurlow,) a day or two after I had spoken; he told me that he liked very much all I had said, though he could not agree with me in my conclusion against entering into the treaty. I said there was one point which I had but

just touched, for fear of saying too much upon it, which, if it were likely to take place, would reconcile me in a great measure to the treaty, and that I hoped it had been thoroughly discussed in the cabinet. He asked what it was; I answered it was the chance of our becoming, in a great degree, the carriers of the produce and manufactures of both France and Great Britain, by which our marine would be greatly increased. He replied, that he expected what I alluded to would take place, and that I had conducted myself as a real statesman, in not dwelling on that subject. So much for the Chancellor's flattery.

The Bishop of Landaff's speech in the House of Lords, against entering into a commercial treaty with France, as reported in Debrett's Parliamentary Register.

"The Bishop of Landaff said, he had yesterday expatiated a little beyond the immediate subject of the then debate; he had done it with design, and his design was, that he might on that day, (one of the

most important that the nation had ever seen,) take up less of that time which Their Lordships could employ so much more to their satisfaction, in listening to others than to him: with the same view he would not recur to what he had yesterday advanced, though he must take the liberty of differing from the noble Marquis, with respect to the importance of our trade with France, in iron, and other articles in the time of Charles the Second; and he thought it by no means proved, that France had made so little improvement in her manufactures, whilst we had made so much in ours, as to render the trade now decidedly safe, which was then clearly dangerous; but he would not dwell on this point; though it would admit an ample discussion, he would take new ground; he would proceed to examine the motives which had induced His Majesty's ministers to negociate a treaty with France, and to abandon the policy of their ancestors. But when he spoke of examining the motives, he must be understood to mean only the open and avowed motives; there might be secret ones of more weight and authority

than any which he had heard spoken of; and when he considered the enlarged views, the profound policy, the retrospective wisdom, and the prospective sagacity which always ought, and usually did pervade the conduct of princes, and which, he trusted, had on this occasion actuated the cabinet of His Majesty, he was persuaded that there were such; he was disposed to think that the framers of this treaty had a moral certainty, that the French in consideration of it would never more, either directly or indirectly, disturb us in our possessions in Asia; that they would not by underhand negociation, attempt to rob us of every commercial advantage, every political alliance we had in Europe; that they would not, either secretly or openly, foment dissensions in Ireland. He trusted that His Majesty's ministers had a clear foresight, that in consequence of this treaty our navy would not only not be diminished, that was not enough, but that it would be increased; nor was that enough, but that it would be increased in an higher proportion than the navy of France would be increased, by our becoming the carriers, in a great measure,

of the produce and manufactures of both countries; could this point be proved to his satisfaction, it would go a great way towards lessening his apprehensions of the treaty. He trusted that the persons concerned in forming the treaty, had the strongest expectations, that the introduction of our manufactures into France at this critical period, would be so far from becoming an incentive to French industry, that it would immediately check, and in a short time annihilate their rising manufactures of cotton, cutlery, hardware, and pottery, in which they were so ambitious to rival us. These, and motives such as these, may have been amongst the primary ones, which incited His Majesty's ministers to negociate a treaty with France; but as to the ostensible ones he could see but two of any consequence; one was, a prospect of continuing the peace by opening a commercial intercourse between the two kingdoms; another was, a prospect of augmenting our revenue by extending our trade.

"Would to God, My Lords, he said,

that the spirit of the Christian religion would exert its influence over the hearts of individuals in their public capacity, as much as, we trust, it does over their conduct in private life; then would revenge, avarice, and ambition, which have fattened the earth with the blood of her children, be banished from the councils of princes, and there would be no more war. The time will come, *the prophet hath said it, and I believe it*, the time will assuredly come, when nation, literally speaking, shall no longer lift up hand against nation. No man will rejoice, My Lords, more than I shall, to see the time when peace shall depend on an obedience to the benevolent principles of the Gospel; but whilst it is simply made to depend on the selfish prospects of commercial policy, I can have no confidence in its continuance; it will not last a moment longer than till it is the interest, real or apparent, of France to break it.

"Had we forgotten; no length of time would ever obliterate the circumstance from his memory, it even yet rankled in his recollection; had we not heard during

the progress of the American war, every annual Speech from the Throne, every monthly dispatch from our Minister at Paris, (of whose ability to detect hypocrisy, had it been possible to detect it, no one could doubt,) announced to this honest, unsuspecting nation, the peaceable disposition of the cabinet at Versailles; and yet, when the long wished for auspicious moment arrived, in which she could most distress us, most benefit herself, with what bold and barefaced perfidy did she break the peace? And shall we even now, whilst we are yet smarting from the consequences of her treachery, become a second time the good easy dupes of her duplicity; it was not a trifling lustration that would in his mind expiate the perfidy of French councils. He admired the French as an intelligent and an ingenious people; he loved them as an agreeable and polite people; but he dreaded them as a great, he suspected them as a negociating, and he detested them as an ambitious people. Let no man, he said, talk to me of exchanging ancient prejudices for liberal sentiments.

He hoped he did not want more than others did, liberality of sentiment in private life; but liberality of sentiment was a complex idea, the component parts of which, when applied to great nations, he could not unfold; before he could begin to think liberally of France, he must learn to forget America. He would not part with his prejudices against France; they were prejudices, which had for ages preserved the independence and liberty of his country, and he would carry them to his grave with him; he did not say that France was the *natural* enemy of Great Britain; but he said more, he believed her to be the *political enemy of the liberties of every state in Europe*; in a word, he could not trust her. He was sorry to have occasion to use such plain language; but not to suspect where you had been deceived, was to act with the credulity of a child; not to take warning from experience, was to act with an audacious temerity, which no prospect of advantage could justify. He meant to say on this point, that how zealously soever he wished, as a man and a Christian, for the

peace of the world, the prospect of a continuance of the peace with France did not operate on his mind with any force whatever, as a reason for approving the commercial treaty. There might, or there might not be other reasons for approving it, but this was none. We are at peace; both nations are sick of war; there wants not a commercial treaty to preserve the peace, or if there did, it would be inefficacious to the end; since every interest of France, her landed, manufacturing, and commercial interest, would be made to stoop to her ambition. This commercial regulation was an opiate by which she wished to lull this nation into a torpid state of confidential security until she acquired strength by cajoling some, by intimidating other powers in Europe, to strike the blow she had never ceased aiming at this country.

" He came, he said, to the consideration of the other ostensible motive for this treaty; the prospect of increasing the revenue, by extending the trade of the country. There was an argument in favour of this point, which in the opinion of many

would be conclusive; it was the approbation of the manufacturing interest of this country; he said approbation, for when the manufacturers were silent, we might be sure they were pleased—*tacent, satis laudant*; this argument, he doubted not, would be used with great force by the favourers of this treaty; the silence of the manufacturers would, on this occasion, have a more prevailing eloquence than attended their speech on a former occasion. It had been remarked, that in theological controversy, the opinions of the ancient fathers of the church were treated wth respect or contempt, according as they happened to make for or against the party; and the opinions of manufacturers, on political subjects, seemed to meet with a similar fate; for when they made for us, they were highly extolled; when they made against us, they were treated with ridicule and neglect.

"No man could have a greater respect for our manufacturers, many of whom he had long personally known, than he had; he made no question, they were able to explain the consistency of their conduct on

this occasion, compared with the line they followed when the Irish propositions were before Parliament; but, to his apprehension, there was scarcely a single objection to the Irish propositions, which did not apply with equal or greater force to this treaty. He would not enter into the detail, but he had read the evidence with great attention, which the manufacturers delivered at their Lordships' bar; and he was convinced, that all that was said concerning cheapness of labour, price of raw materials, lightness of taxation, exemption from duties, inefficacy of countervailing duties, facility of smuggling, and other points, was as applicable to the commercial treaty as it was to the Irish propositions; and every one must acknowledge, that the industry, ingenuity, and capital of France, was more dangerous to the manufactures of this country, than the ingenuity, industry, and capital of Ireland could have been. There was one difference, he owned, between the two countries; our manufacturers were in possession of the Irish market; they could derive no benefit from the Irish

propositions, and that was a good reason why they should run no risk; they are not in possession of the French market, and that is a reason why they should run a risk to obtain it. The speculation of pouring at first a large quantity of goods into France, was a bewitching speculation of profit; but it did in no degree whatever invalidate the danger of future competition, as established by their own evidence.

"But, leaving the consistency of the manufacturers to be explained by themselves, it was necessary that he should explain his own. He was a friend to the Irish propositions, and he was an enemy to the commercial treaty. Where was the consistency of conduct? clearly in this, that France and Ireland stand in very different relations to this country. He was a friend to the Irish propositions, not from a full persuasion that the arrangements, which they held out, would not in many instances have interfered with the manufacturing interests of Great Britain; but from a conviction that the wealth, strength, dignity, and consequence of Ireland would primarily or ulti-

mately be the wealth, strength, dignity, and consequence of Great Britain. He was an enemy to this treaty, from a full persuasion that it would in many instances interfere with the manufacturing interests of Great Britain, and from a conviction that the wealth of France was the poverty of Britain, its strength our weakness, its dignity our disgrace. Aggrandize Ireland even at your own risk, still it is the empire which is made rich and powerful; aggrandize France at the risk of your disadvantage, and you accelerate the ruin of the empire.

" The most favourable argument for the treaty (though it was an argument of little force when compared with the unfavourable political tendency of the treaty) was the probability of our trade being greatly extended; and this probability was thought to be converted into a certainty by the acquiescence of the manufacturers. He did not mean to question the judgment of the manufacturers; it was far superior to his own. He did not mean to say, that they were actuated by present prospects of

gain, and were unsolicitous about future contingent dangers to the state, though, if that was the principle of their conduct, he thought, as manufacturers, they would be justified; for it was out of their province to become guardians of the nation's welfare; but, waving all this, he would submit one argument to the judgment of the House; and he trusted it would be considered as an argument of great weight, inasmuch as it was derived from the information of the manufacturers themselves.

"One of the most intelligent, and every way most respectable, manufacturers in this kingdom, delivered it as his decided opinion at their Lordships' bar, that it was by our machines, presses, dies, and tools, that the British manufacturers were enabled to baffle all competition with foreign markets, notwithstanding every disadvantage of high price of labour, high taxes, and the other contingent burdens, under which our manufactures laboured; and that in proportion as these tools were exported or copied into foreign countries, our exports of manufactures to those countries would

decrease. The legislature, in conformity to this opinion, enacted a law, prohibiting the exportation of tools: now he had it on the very best authority, that, notwithstanding this law, every tool used at Sheffield, at Birmingham, and at Manchester, might be seen in a public building at Paris, where they were deposited for the inspection of their workmen. The person, from whom he had this intelligence, was one of the most expert manufacturers at Birmingham, and one of the best judges of tools in the world; and he acknowledged with regret, that the intention of the Act he had mentioned was wholly frustrated. Thus then stands the argument; in proportion as our tools are copied into foreign countries, our exports to those countries must decrease. France had our tools; the conclusion is, she will not take our manufactures. The premises were derived from undoubted testimony, and the conclusion was not illogical.

"The value of our iron exports was, according to one calculation, a tenth, according to another, a ninth part of the value of all the other exports of the

country: and, it was with concern he mentioned it, in this manufactory of iron the French were at that moment making the greatest exertions. They cast pig-iron in Burgundy; and one of our own countrymen, who was related to one of the most distinguished iron-masters in England, was said to be associated with the French in that business. They know how to cast cylinders, and to bore them for steam-engines, to the full as well as we did. Their cutlery at Mouslins was brought to so great perfection, that it equalled the Sheffield cutlery in neatness and taste, and excelled it in cheapness; they had large cutlery manufactories, in which they had several patterns not known at Birmingham, and some of them more elegant than any there. The importation of our hardware into France, which was looked upon as one of the most favourite features of the treaty, would not, he apprehended, be at present to any great extent; it would soon be nothing; and ere long France, it was to be feared, would import more into this country.

" But, it may be thought, (he had heard

it observed,) that our great plenty of pit-coal is of itself a circumstance so much in our favour, that though the French might have our tools, and be desirous of emulating us in all our manufactures, they would not be able to stand a competition with us, notwithstanding the cheapness of their labour. This, he said, was an unsafe foundation to build on. No nation ever began to look for fuel under ground, till their woods were gone; and whoever had compared the strata of earth in France with those where coal was found in England, (for it was not found every where with us; he did not know whether it had ever been found under chalk,) could entertain no doubt of coal existing as plentifully in France as in England. But if this should be thought the mere reverie of a philosopher, he would substantiate the conjecture by an authority which none of their Lordships, who happened to be acquainted with the works of Mr. Hellot, would think fit to deny. This gentleman published, in the year 1750, two volumes in 4to. on mining; and in the preface to the first volume he

had this observation, which he would give their Lordships in English, for he had not kept commerce enough with France to speak their language as a Parisian.—" We " find, in almost all the provinces of this " kingdom, mines of pit-coal, the coal of " which is at least as good as that of Eng- " land and Scotland, in favour of which " men were so much prepossessed."—Here is a testimony of the most unexceptionable kind, and it is confirmed by fact; the French use coal in the various fabrics which are established in Normandy, in Burgundy, in Languedoc, and in other places; he believed they had lately begun to char it, and to use it in that state in the fabrics at Paris. He had been told, that their coal was pyritous and slaty; it was not all so, and that was a fault which would probably mend as they dug deeper. They imported from this country about 12,000 chaldrons a year, and the importation would increase till their coal-pits got established.

" He had touched upon the exertions of the French in the iron-manufactory, and as to the glass-manufactory, that, it was

allowed on all hands, must be given up, or the excise taken off. Germany, France, and Ireland, already undersold us in glass at foreign markets. He did not agree with the noble Marquis in thinking, that our plate-glass would alone be in danger. They would import common glass. He would give their Lordships an instance which had come to his knowledge, of the great activity of the French, in the most difficult part of this manufacture, in cutting glass. They had but very lately, within these two or three years, made any serious attempts in this business; and he had seen a cut-glass cup, bought at a retail shop in Paris, last summer, for 2*s.* 11*d.*, in which the workmanship was exceedingly good. One of our best London workmen was ordered, by one of the first cut-glass manufacturers in the kingdom, to cut a similar cup; he did so; and he charged five shillings for the workmanship alone. What the low price of labour will do in other instances, may be gathered from what it has done in this. It was quite a mistake to suppose that the French either wanted ingenuity

or industry. It was not many years ago since the Swiss printed linens became so fashionable in Paris, that no duties or prohibition could keep them out of that city; the manufacturers of printed linens in Paris foresaw the ruin of their fabric, unless they exerted themselves; they did exert themselves, and they now employ the poor people in that branch, and make as beautiful printed linens as any in the world. He could give many other instances of French enterprise and activity; but it would be needless; no one considered liberally and intelligently, how manufacturing skill is transferred by various accidents from one country to another, but must be alarmed with a serious apprehension even for our home-market. Our coarse woollens would be secure, till the French learnt how to manage their sheep properly; but our superfines would be beat out of our home-market, or our manufacturers, instead of a mixture of Spanish and English wool, would be obliged to use nothing but Spanish. He had seen Spanish wool manufactured in England to the

amount of four guineas a yard, but when our cloths should be made as fine as the French cloths are, they would be sold dearer. He thought not much of their dyes; he had seen as good black and as good scarlet dyed in England as were ever dyed in France; but it was the hardness of our cloths, compared with the French cloths, which hindered them from taking so good a dye. Great quantities of woollens were smuggled into both countries at 14*l.* per cent.: the duty of 12*l.* per cent. would prevent smuggling; but he had no great expectation that France would be a much greater market than it was at present for our woollens. At the treaty of Utrecht, our woollens were prohibited: the French woollen manufactory was then in its infancy; since the year 1760, it has been in very high perfection; it feared not now a competition with the English manufactory; and if there had been the least apprehension for its safety, the French ministry would never have suffered the importation of our woollens upon such an easy duty; they would sedulously have protected

a manufactory which had been raised at an immense expense, by government, for above a century. We had nothing to hope from the extension of our woollen trade; they might take a few more coarse goods from us, in order to mix them with their own for the American market, and this, he thought, would be a practice they would follow, and much to our detriment in other articles besides our woollens.

"But it would be endless, he said, to enter into a detail of all the probable disadvantages of this treaty, and he rather wished to avoid it, from knowing that we could come to no certainty on the subject; for though it was a fair mode of arguing to oppose conjecture to conjecture, speculative disadvantages to speculative advantages; though it might be the most satisfactory mode that the subject would admit, yet it was not a mode he was fond of. It was the misfortune of this treaty that we could know nothing of it but from experiment, and in making the experiment we may be undone.

"But there was a disadvantage in it

which he wished he could call speculative; the loss which the revenue would sustain by a diminution of the duties on wines, &c. He would not enter into any calculation on the subject; it had, however, been calculated, he thought properly, to amount to 300,000*l.* a year. There was but one article in which, from the operation of the treaty, this sum could be made up, and, as he had not heard it insisted on, His Majesty's ministers were welcome to the observation, for he had nothing in view but truth. The calculation had proceeded on the supposition that no more wine would be drunk when the duties were lowered, than was drunk at present. This supposition he thought erroneous. He was convinced that for every two pipes of Port which should not be imported, three pipes at least of Claret would be imported, and the additional duty on that additional pipe would compensate the loss arising from the diminution of duty on the quantity now imported. This was proved by what had happened within these few years in Ireland. When the Irish drank little wine

except Claret, they consumed near a third more wine than when their Portugal importation was equal to their French one. He thought this country consumed nearer thirty than twenty thousand tons of wine in a year, home-brewed and foreign-brewed; and if but half of what was consumed should be brought from France, half a million of our money, or of our manufactures, must be sent to pay for that article; and he thought they were more likely to take our money than our manufactures; and he had rather our money was lent to any nation in Europe than to France.

" Before he sat down he would take notice of two arguments, which were generally adduced in favour of the treaty.

" It was said then, that as France is supposed to contain twenty-four millions of people, and Britain not above eight millions, we shall open to ourselves a market three times as great as the French will open to themselves; and that this was a solid advantage in our favour. He had been told that this was the very argument by which the French ministry endeavoured

to prove to us, simple Englishmen, the great favour that France was about to do us, and Their Lordships had just heard it adopted by a noble Marquis; but let it be adopted by whom it might, he could not adopt it; it had a specious appearance, but no foundation; to give it any weight, it should be shown, which had never yet been done, that these twenty-four millions of people had as much occasion for our commodities as we had for theirs, and as much money to lay out in purchasing them, as we had to lay out in purchasing theirs. It should be shown that they would as certainly clothe themselves with our woollens and cottons, as we should drink their wines and brandies; it was not the number of people, but the number of purchasers that constituted a good market.

"Another argument in favour of the treaty, was built on a foundation still more unsafe.

"It was said that our resources will be increased by an extension of our commerce in so high a degree, that, in case of a future

rupture, we shall be more able than ever we were to contend with France.

"This argument was of no possible importance, unless it could be shown that the resources of France will not be increased in so high a rate as ours will be: and this has not, and perhaps cannot, be shown.

"But, without enquiring how, from the operation of the treaty, the 300,000*l.*, which he before mentioned as a defalcation in the customs, could be restored;—without examining whether, after this sum was made up, the additional increase of our customs would be greater than the additional increase of the French customs;—without discussing the probability of the balance of our trade with France being in our favour now, which, the last time it was open between the two countries, was so prodigiously against us;—waving all the minutiæ of speculative calculation, which nothing but the event could justify on either side, he thought there was an argument, by which it might be shown, that this treaty would contribute to increase the resources of France in a far

higher ratio than it would increase our own; and the argument was this.—England, out of her eight millions of inhabitants, employs five millions in her manufactures (it was of no consequence to his conclusion whether it was four or five millions). By the industry and ingenuity of these manufacturers, she had not only supplied her own markets, but had constantly drawn from the other parts of the world those sums by which she had acquired her present wealth and strength. When France became a manufacturing country, of her twenty-four millions of inhabitants she would employ fifteen millions in manufactures, and thus, by applying the same means to acquire wealth and strength that we had done, she would acquire three times as much; and, therefore, he looked upon this treaty which incited the French nation to become a manufacturing nation, as contributing to increase her resources in a far higher proportion than it would increase our own, and on that account he thought it was founded on a very short-sighted policy. But, it might be urged,

how does the present treaty second the commercial intentions of France? Many ways; it seconded the intentions of France in opening to her our home-market, which was the richest market in Europe; it seconded her intentions in exciting her own people to a degree of industry and ingenuity, in order to support their present fabrics; and thus was she spurred to her purpose, both by the fear of loss, and the prospect of advantage; but, above all, it seconded her intentions, by giving her every opportunity she could wish for, of acquiring that manufacturing skill, by which we at present surpassed her and all the world.

"This, he said, was an injury which we should certainly sustain; and it was an injury of such an immense magnitude, that it was not a few hundred thousand pounds a year, it was not half a million, or a whole million, or any sum which the most sanguine financier could expect from the treaty, in addition to our customs, which could in any degree compensate it. If France shall ever cultivate manufactures

and commerce in the same degree that we have done, and that we do, our ruin will be inevitable. There was no policy so good as that which would prevent her from doing so, none so pernicious as that which facilitated her endeavours, and stimulated her exertions in that way; and this treaty did both in a very alarming degree.

"He had fatigued, he said, the patience of the House; he would trespass no farther than to say, that he was not conscious of having endeavoured to give an undue weight to any thing he had advanced; many, many topics he had, for the sake of brevity, entirely omitted; he had spoken his real opinion as an honest man. *His spirit had ever been too high to enlist himself under the banners of administration, or of any opposition; he would always follow the dictates of his own judgment, and, in cases where his abilities would not enable him to form a judgment, he would not vote.* Any other conduct, he thought, would be a profanation of the holy habit which he then wore. On the present occasion, his judgment was full, clear, decided, positive, against the

treaty. If the event of things should prove this judgment to have been erroneous, he would be the first to rejoice at his mistake; the first to ridicule, in the future prosperity of his country, the present imbecility of his reasoning."

Soon after this I was reduced to the last extremity by a dysentery. The doctors were in despair, but my spirits were uniformly good, and they saved me. After a month's confinement to my bed, I was sent to Bath, the waters of which place did me no good. On my leaving Bath, the man who attended at the pump congratulated me on my having received no benefit: I asked him what he meant. "Because," said he, "I never knew any one who got a fit of the gout by drinking the waters, who ever got rid of it again." I leave it to the Bath physicians to refute this calumny against King Bladud.

On my return from Bath to Cambridge, my physicians absolutely insisted on my never more presiding in the Divinity

schools. I offered a grace to the Senate, appointing Dr. Kipling my deputy; this grace was passed, *nem diss.*, May 26th, 1787, with many expressions, of the most flattering kind, from all the leading members of the Senate, regretting the occasion of its being necessary. Doctor Kipling had offered his services to me as a deputy, when I was made a Bishop; but having determined never to appoint a deputy, whilst my health would permit me to perform the duty of my office, I had at that time declined his courtesy; I now accepted it, and gave him a stipend of 200*l.* at first, and soon after of 250*l.* a year, and latterly of more than two-thirds of what the Professorship was worth, when it came into my hands.

I concluded my speech at the following Commencement with a kind of farewell address to the University, which then had, and still has, my warmest wishes for its prosperity:—

" *Habetis, auditores spectatissimi, quod in hâc temporis brevitate et angustiâ de gravis-*

simâ quæstione proferre potui; pauca de meipso dicenda restant. Oratorem profecto τα περι σεαυτου *balbutientem Atticæ fastidiunt aures: me tamen de meis rebus breviter loquentem benignè exaudiatis rogo; atque hoc humanitatis vestræ indicium eo fidentius expecto, quod vestra negotia nostris quodammodo implicata arbitrabamini.*

"Adversâ per sex fere integros annos valetudine laboravi; per hoc spatium Scholæ me Præsidem sæpius habuerunt, quum, ni vis animi corporis vim superâsset, in lectulo queritantem habuissent medici. Privatum hoc incommodum non queror, nec idem diutius tulisse recusâssem, modo summo hoc vestro munere rite defungi diutius potuissem. Medicis, extrema mihi in scholarum pistrino diutius sudanti prædicantibus, aurem animumve non antea præbui, quam Academiæ commoditatem, scholarum disciplinam, munerisque honestissimi dignitatem, nostro infortunio potius quam culpâ in discrimen adduci videbam: verum fateor, morbi sanationem meam multum diuque flagitantis maximum malum habui, quod negotia vestra scholastica me quodammodo negligere coegit.

"Qualem, academici, me habuistis profes-

sorem non est ut ipse dicam, at de modo atque animo, quibus res vestras curavi, verbum audire haud vos pigebit.

" In disputationibus theologicis ab usu vocabulorum quæ in sacro codice non reperiuntur, qualia sunt ουσια, ομοȣσια, ομοιȣσια, τριας, peccatum originale, sacramentum, satisfactio, quantum potui abstinere, religio mihi fuit. Pleraque ex his similibusque vocabulis excogitavit scholasticorum acumen, quo adversariorum convellant et sua tueantur judicia. Verum enimvero quam maxime verendum est, ne dum modorum mixtorum ideas, ac verba nova ad eas designendas ex arbitrio fingamus, potius quam ex sacris codicibus hauriamus, a veritate aberramus ; ne verbis αγραφοις ad dogmata etiam αγραφα propaganda utamur. Si quid in verbo Dei occultum nobis ac involutum sit, humano id aperire judicio, novis verbis exponere, frustra conabimur.

" Articulos ecclesiæ Anglicanæ ad doctrinam aliquam confirmandam in scholis theologicis citari nunquam permisi ; id autem prohibui, non quòd istos articulos temno, sed quòd Scripta evangelica et apostolica, Cranmeri ac Ridleii scriptis, imo ecclesiarum omnium ac

conciliorum decretis antepono. Cum purum veritatis fontem mihi licuit adire, rivulos inde hominum studiis deductos, ligni, fœni, stipularum sordibus inquinatos, sectari, totis viribus recusavi. Hanc in disputando Παῤῥησιαν, *ipsa commendat vel certè non improbat ecclesia nostra, cum nihil pro articulo fidei habendum statuit, nisi quod ex sacrâ Scripturâ probari possit. Utrum vero dogma aliquod ex sacrâ Scripturâ probari possit necne, nullibi honestius quam in scholis academicis disquirendum videtur.*

" *Nonnulla in ecclesiâ Anglicanâ, tam doctrinam ejus quam disciplinam et reditûs distributionem respicientia, magno cum religionis Christianæ commodo, magno cum ecclesiæ ac reipublicæ emolumento, posse novari, me olim censuisse, et in eâdem adhuc perstare sententiâ lubens fateor. Hæc autem omnia atque singula in scholis theologicis disputare, de industriâ vitavi. Hominis quidem non est honesti quæ privatus improbat publicè defendere; neque tamen regii in theologiâ professoris unquam esse arbitrabor, nova, quæ privatus probat, publicâ suâ defensione aliis commendare, aut de antiquis, legum auctoritate mu-*

nitis et sancitis robur ac dignitatem suam scholasticâ disputatione derogari. Hæc quidem mea placita aliis obtrudere non conor. Zelum proselytos opinionibus de re quâcunque nostris adjiciendi nullum omnino sentio; hæc tamen in mente meâ radices altius egerunt, quam ut ineptis frivolorum hominum ratiunculis aut insulsis malevolorum dicteriis inde evellantur. Miseris quidem hisce insipientium obtrectationibus responsum afferre, licet nullo id fiat negotio, hactenus non sum dignatus neque in posterum dignabor.

" Quæstiones à respondentibus in scholis discutiendas, propositas nullas rejeci. Nolui enim pro auctoritate papali aliis os occludere, quasi id cogitans me solum ad veritatem esse ascensum, aut id metuens ne evangelium Christi sicut evangelium Papæ sanorum indagine labefactatum corruat. Sacros codices in scholis vestris humili summissoque in Deum animo tractavi; quæ clarè docent, docui; quæ silent, de iisdem ipse silui; quæ captum humanum superantia credenda tradunt, sine ullâ dubitatione ipse credens, aliis amplectenda commendavi. Eximium illum virum quem, vobis benignè consentientibus, in locum meum suffeci,

laudare nolo, ne adulari videar. Id tantum de eo dicam, quod mei in scholis regiminis nullum sub ejus præsidio restabit desiderium, nostri in hoc theatro laboris, eo perorante, brevi apud vos omnis peribit memoria.

" Summæ autem vestræ in me benevolentiæ gratam recordationem, dum per quatuor olim annos moderatoris officio functus fuerim, dum per septem fere annos chemiam colui, dum per sedecim hosce annos scholis theologicis præfui, quum tandem me non senio attritum, sed morbo inveterato fere confectum, rude donastis, nulla unquam delebit dies, nulla conditionis, (si qua fiat) imminuet mutatio.

" Academiam Cantabrigiensem patronam mihi semper concupivi, honestissimam enim semper judicavi. Gloriam enim, quæ est consentiens laus bonorum, lucro semper anteposui ac antepono. Mallem proinde vestram comprobationem promereri, quàm summis in ecclesiæ opibus frui aut dignitatibus. Ecclesia enim bona sua cum indignis et indoctis, cum iis qui nihil sciunt nisi quo potissimum modo divitum sectentur mensas, aut principes in republicâ adulentur viros, haud raro participat: vestræ autem comprobationi non patet aditus,

nisi quâ ducunt morum probitas, erudita industria, doctrina solida. Hæc, auditores optimi, de Almâ nostrâ Matre semper dixi, hæc dum vixero dicam."

With this speech I took my leave of University-business, in which I had been incessantly engaged for near thirty-three years. My application had injured my health, and I was under a necessity of forbearing it for the future. In truth, had my health been better, I should have felt little inclination to persevere in my studies in the manner I had done. I could not bring myself to vote as a minister bade me, on all occasions; and I perceived that, such was the temper of the times, or such was the temper of the man, nothing less than that would secure his attention. I saw this to be the case, then, and I then and at all times disdained complying with principles of government so abominably corrupt. I once talked a little to the first Lord Camden on this subject; and he plainly told me, that I had better go to Cambridge and employ myself in writing books, than pretend to follow my

own judgment in political matters; that he never knew any man who had attempted to do it, except one very *honest* man, who was little valued by any party,—Sir Joseph Jekyll.

After the Commencement, I went, for the re-establishment of my health, into Westmoreland, and, wnen there, I received the following letter from the Duke of Norfolk, to whom I was then but little known:—

"Greystoke, Aug. 4, 1787.

"My Lord,

"I CANNOT refrain from giving your Lordship the information of the death of the Bishop of Carlisle, which happened this day. My friends, no more than myself, have any thing to say to the disposition of the bishoprick; so can only add, that I should be glad to know Your Lordship's wishes and power could lead you thither, which (I speak with confidence) would give great satisfaction to this county, and to none more than to, My Lord,

"Your Lordship's obedient servant,

"NORFOLK."

THE TANJORE MAHARAJA SERFOGI'S SARASWATI MAHAL

Answer.

"Dallam Tower, Aug. 24th, 1787.

"My Lord Duke,

"YOUR Grace's very obliging letter, which I received yesterday at this place, demands my sincerest thanks; I beg your Grace to believe that I am incapable of ever forgetting this instance of your attention. The assurances you have been pleased to give me, of my being not unacceptable to the county of Cumberland, have afforded me more pleasure than the possession of the See of Carlisle would have done; for the approbation of good men is both a proof, and a proper reward, of a good conduct.

"I have no wish whatever respecting the See of Carlisle, nor have made any, the most distant, application for it; and if I had wished for it ever so much, the determination I have formed, of conducting myself independently in parliament, would have been little likely to have promoted my pretensions.

"I sincerely hope, for the credit of the

Church and of religion, that neither the bishoprick of Carlisle, nor any other bishoprick, will be prostituted in promoting the purposes of parliamentary policy.

"I am, &c.

"R. LANDAFF."

About a month before the death of the Bishop of Carlisle, a relation of Sir James Lowther had preached the Commencement-sermon, at Cambridge. Mr. Pitt happened to sit next to me at church, and asked me the name of the Preacher, not much approving his performance. I told him report said that he was to be the future bishop of Carlisle; and I begged him to have some respect to the dignity of the Bench, whenever a vacancy happened. He assured me that he knew nothing of any such arrangement. Within two months after this, Sir James Lowther applied to Mr. Pitt for the bishoprick of Carlisle, for the gentleman whom he had heard preach, and Mr. Pitt, without the least hesitation, promised it. This was one of the many transactions that gave me an unfavourable

opinion of Mr. Pitt; I saw that he was ready to sacrifice things the most sacred to the furtherance of his ambition. The gentleman, much to his honour, declined the acceptance of the bishoprick, which Mr. Pitt, with true ministerial policy, had offered him.

The medical faculty having represented to me, in the most serious terms, the necessity of abandoning all literary pursuits, if I wished to preserve my health and life; and knowing that, if I lived in Cambridge, the *genius loci* would not suffer me to abandon them; and having no place of residence in my diocese, nor a desire to procure a change of situation by a prostitution of principle; and being conscious, moreover, that the activity of my mind would not suffer me to dream away life without employment, I turned my attention to the improvement of land. I thought that the improvement of a man's fortune by cultivating the earth was the most useful and honourable mode of providing for a family; and I believed also that it would be the most

likely mode of restoring my constitution. I have now been several years occupied as an improver of land and a planter of trees. My health is better now (1809) than it was, but the original disorder has never left me; and I have been so successful in these pursuits, that I now am under no uneasiness as to the provision which I thought it my duty to make for my children; my wishes on that point having been always moderate; and I feel such satisfaction at this moment in having, by my own exertions, wholly counteracted the effects which might otherwise have followed the neglect I have experienced from the court, or from its ministers, or from both, that I sincerely pity, and cordially forgive the littleness of mind which, in some one or other, has occasioned it.

In October, 1787, the public sustained a great and I an irreparable loss by the death of the Duke of Rutland in Ireland. I call it an irreparable loss, not so much from any service which he might and assuredly would have rendered me in the

line of my profession, as from his being a man for whom I had a very great regard. I was not, at any time of life, studious of having a great many friends, nor ever stepped a yard out of my way to court the acquaintance of any man of rank; but I had, about that period, lost many of those who had been long and warmly attached to me, and I knew not how to form new connexions, being very fastidious in the choice of those whom I took into my confidence. I was very much affected by this immature and unexpected death of the Duke; and on the 27th of the following November, on the opening of the session of parliament, I concluded a speech which I then made in praise of the measure which administration had taken with respect to Holland, in the following terms:—

"Will the House permit me to indulge my private feelings, for a single moment, on a different subject? It is a subject which none of Your Lordships will ever hear of without regret, which I shall never think of without sorrow,—*the death of the Duke of Rutland!* The dead listen not to the com-

mendations of the living, or, dearly as I loved him, I would not now have praised him!

"The world, My Lords, was not aware of his ability, was not conscious of half his worth; I had long and just experience of them both.

"In the conduct of public affairs, his judgment was equalled, I verily believe, by few men of his years; his probity and disinterestedness were, I am confident, exceeded by none. All the letters which I received from him respecting the public state of Ireland, and they were not a few, were written with strong good sense, and in nervous language. They all breathed the same liberal spirit, had all the same noble tendency—not that of aggrandizing Great Britain by the ruin of Ireland, not that of building up Ireland, at the expense of Great Britain—but that of promoting the united interests of both countries, as essential parts of one common empire.

"In private life, My Lords, I know that he had a strong sense of religion on his mind, and he shewed it by imitating his

illustrious father in the practice of one of its most characteristic principles—in being alive to every impulse of compassion. His family, his friends, his dependants, all his connexions can witness for me the warmth and the sincerity of his personal attachments.

"From the time this young nobleman was admitted under me at Cambridge, I have loved him with the affection of a brother; and I have through life, on every occasion of difficulty, spoken to him (and I now thank God that I have done so) with the firmness and sincerity of a father. Your Lordships will judge, then, all private interest totally out of the question, how inexpressibly I have been, and am afflicted by his death.

"His memory, I trust will be long, long revered by the people of this country, long held dear by the people of Ireland; and by myself, I feel that it will continue to be held most dear as long as I live."

This tribute of my respect for the poor Duke, then unburied, (whose name was not

so much as mentioned in the King's speech,) was very well received by the House; and, a month afterwards, the Prince of Wales, who had heard it, but to whom I had never been presented, came up to me in the House of Lords and thanked me for it, in a manner highly flattering to me, and honourable to his own feelings, as a friend to the Duke of Rutland.

The day after I had spoken this short eulogy, the Duchess of Rutland requested to see me; I had a melancholy interview with her Grace, and at her desire sent her a copy of what I had said in the House of Lords. On the 30th of November she sent me the following note:—

"My dear Lord,

"I RETURN you many thanks for the paper containing, in so feeling a manner, your sentiments for the dear, dear person who is the subject of it.

"Such an eulogium, from such a respectable character as yours, is most pleasing and satisfactory to me; especially as it

is most true, and as I am sure he deserved all you so eloquently express, which appears to flow from your heart, and which will ever be engraven on mine with gratitude, as well as your kindness and friendship for his sake to,

"My dear Lord Bishop,

"Your faithful friend

"and affectionate humble servant,

"M. T. RUTLAND."

This was the beginning of a correspondence which I carried on with Her Grace for some months. I had always a good opinion of her understanding, and felt myself much interested in every thing respecting her happiness, and that of her children. When she reads this, I shall be no more: but she may know how much I respected her interest in another world as well as in this, by recollecting the substance of the letters which I wrote to her from Bath in March, 1788.

Though levee-conversations are but silly things in themselves, and the silliest of all

possible things when repeated, yet I must mention what happened to myself at the King's levee, in November, 1787. I was standing next to a Venetian nobleman; the King was conversing with him about the republic of Venice, and, hastily turning to me, said, "There, now, you hear what he says of a republic." My answer was, "Sir, I look upon a republic to be one of the worst forms of government." The King gave me, as he thought, another blow about a republic. I answered, that I could not live under a republic. His Majesty still pursued the subject; I thought myself insulted, and firmly said, "Sir, I look upon the tyranny of any one man to be an intolerable evil, and upon the tyranny of an hundred, to be an hundred times as bad." The King went off. His Majesty, I doubt not, had given credit to the calumnies which the court-insects had buzzed into his ears, of my being a favourer of republican principles, because I was known to be a supporter of revolution principles, and had a pleasure in letting me see what he thought of me. This was not quite fair

in the King, especially as there is not a word in any of my writings in favour of a republic, and as I had desired Lord Shelburne, before I accepted the bishoprick, to assure His Majesty of my supreme veneration for the constitution. If he thought that in giving such assurance I stooped to tell a lie for the sake of a bishoprick, His Majesty formed an erroneous opinion of my principles. But the reign of George the Third was the triumph of Toryism. The Whigs had power for a moment, they quarrelled amongst themselves, and thereby lost the King's confidence, lost the people's confidence, and lost their power for ever; or, to speak more philosophically, there was neither *Whiggism* nor *Toryism* left; excess of riches, and excess of taxes, combined with excess of luxury, had introduced universal *Selfism.*

In April, 1788, I received the following letter from Calcutta:

"My Lord,

A DESIGN is now on foot for establishing

a Protestant mission in Bengal and Bahar, and we take the liberty to inclose a copy of a proposal, which will briefly explain to Your Lordship the principal matters requisite to make a mission in this country successful.

"It cannot but affect with grief every good man, to see whole nations sitting in the darkness of Paganism, which are subject to Protestant rulers. If the real miseries of such a state were known in England, it is not to be doubted but Christian zeal would soon devise a remedy in communicating the pure principles of the Gospel, which would reform both the disorders of society, and the most horrid depravity of manners that can be imagined. The work proposed is indeed difficult, and will require no small exertion to carry it into effect, but it is doubtless practicable. Should the Government and Company afford it a slender support, and shelter it from persecution, it would certainly flourish. The access to the country-languages grows easier every day. The invention of types gives the nation, in their own characters and lan-

guages, whatever intelligence the Government here finds necessary to communicate to the people at large. Missionaries would have many other advantages now, which have not been in former times, and there is great probability that they would be able to surmount the remaining obstacles, and to disseminate among the Heathen the principles of Christianity.

"We are conscious, we need not urge this matter with Your Lordship, who appears to be so well disposed to encourage the propagation of the Gospel in the East. Your Lordship's sentiments are before the public, (in the sermon before the Lords, January 30th, 1784,) and what is therein so nobly proposed, will no doubt be ably defended and zealously supported. A copy of the inclosed is sent to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, as the first minister of the Established Church, will have it greatly in his power to procure for it the countenance of Majesty. We are certain Your Lordship will be happy to concur in any measure His Grace may propose for carrying the proposal into effect,

and we humbly hope Your Lordship's fervent wishes in this and other ecclesiastical concerns will meet with the success they merit.

"We are, my Lord,

"Your Lordship's most faithful

"and devoted Servants,

D. BROWN, Minister of the Orphan House.

W. CHAMBERS,
CHA. GRANT,
GEO. STUDY.
Of the Company's Civil Service."

I had been for many years, as Professor of Divinity, a chartered member of the Society for propagating the Gospel in foreign Parts, but I had never subscribed to it, nor attended its meetings, from at first suspecting, and afterwards from knowing, (see Baron Maseres' Canadian Freeholder, vol. iii. p. 424,) that its missionaries had been more busy in bringing over dissenters to episcopacy, than in converting Heathens to Christianity; but the establishment of a mission in the East Indies had my approbation, and I had ordained Mr. Brown a deacon, when the Bishop of London would

not ordain him for want of a title. The Orphan School was just then established, by the subscription of the British Officers, for the education of the children of the soldiers by the women of the country; and I thought a clergyman might be as usefully engaged in such a school, (though it was not a legal title,) as in a village-curacy in England; and that such a school would be instrumental in extending the English language among the natives. On the receipt of this letter, I considered how I might best promote its object, and I was soon persuaded that any efforts of mine would be unsuccessful, unless supported by administration; and, thinking that the most probable means of obtaining that support, would be to let it originate with the minister, I sent both the letter and the proposal to Mr. Pitt with the following note:—

"Great George-street, April 9th, 1788.

"Dear Sir,

"Allow me to put into your hands a packet which I received last week from India. I know not whether the subject

mentioned in it has ever engaged the attention of Government, or of the East-India Company; I think it highly worthy the attention of them both. But I presume not to say, whether it would be *practicable* to introduce a knowledge of the Christian religion amongst the natives of Indostan, nor whether the present is the fittest time for making the attempt. All I mean by troubling you on this occasion, is to apprize you of what is in agitation, that, if you think the matter proper to be taken into consideration, you may have the credit of submitting it to the Council, or of supporting it in any other way which you may think more expedient.

"I am, &c.

"R. LANDAFF."

Mr. Pitt took no notice of this communication; nor did the Archbishop of Canterbury ever speak to me on the subject, so that I never had an opportunity of concurring, which I should have been happy to have done, with His Grace in the prosecution of the design.

THE LAHORE ... MAHAL

I do not, indeed, expect much success in propagating Christianity by missionaries from any part of Christendom, but I expect much from the extension of science and of commerce. The empire of Russia is emerging from its barbarism, and when it has acquired a stability and strength answering to its extent, it will enlarge its borders; and, casting an ambitious eye on Thibet, Japan, and China, may introduce, with its commerce, Christianity into those countries. India will be christianised by the government of Great Britain. Thus Christian monarchs, who aim at nothing but an increase of their temporal kingdoms, may become, by the providence of God, unconscious instruments in propagating the spiritual kingdom of his Son. It will not be easy for missionaries of any nation to make much impression on the Pagans of any country; because missionaries in general, instead of teaching a simple system of Christianity, have perplexed their hearers with unintelligible doctrines not expressly delivered in Scripture, but fabricated from the conceits

and passions, and prejudices of men. Christianity is a rational religion; the Romans, the Athenians, the Corinthians and others, were highly civilised, far advanced in the rational use of their intellectual faculties, and they all, at length, exchanged Paganism for Christianity; the same change will take place in other countries, as they become enlightened by the progress of European literature, and become capable of justly estimating the weight of historical evidence, on which the truth of Christianity must, as to them, depend.

The American Academy of Arts and Sciences, established by a law of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in 1780, transmitted to me a certificate of my being elected a Fellow of their Society, on the 30th April, 1788. I have never had an opportunity of thanking the Academy for this unexpected honour; but I hereby assure them of my gratitude, and of my ardent wishes, that (in conformity to the motto of their seal), *Sub libertate in æternum floreat Academia!*

I this year (1788) published a Charge on visiting my diocese; and composed, printed, and gave away to above a thousand persons whom I then confirmed, a small tract, intitled, "An Address to young Persons after Confirmation." I was sensible, that I might have found a more valuable present than that, which I then gave to the young persons of my diocese; but I flattered myself, that the circumstance of its being composed purposely for their benefit, by the bishop who confirmed them, would give it, in their estimation, a degree of merit it might not otherwise be intitled to.

During the latter end of the year 1788, and the beginning of the next, the understanding of the King was so much deranged, that both Houses of Parliament came to a resolution, That he was incapable of conducting the affairs of Government; and measures were taken to form a Regency. Mr. Fox, in the course of debate, had said—*that the Prince of Wales had a right to assume the Regency*; and Mr. Pitt had said—

that the Prince of Wales had no more right to assume the Regency than any other man in the kingdom had. These opposite sentiments were supported by the partisans of each side with great heat and animosity. I cared nothing about the parties, but considered the subject at Cambridge as calmly as I could; and when the business was so far advanced, that a Bill for appointing the Prince of Wales Regent, with certain limitations in the exercise of his power, was brought into Parliament, I went to London, and made the following speech in the House of Lords. The beginning of the speech is here omitted, as it was merely a defence, (or rather an attempt at a defence,) of the independency of the bishops, and of the Scots Peers, which had been glanced at by the preceding speaker. I had not written down the speech, but I had arranged it in my thoughts, and am so confident of the principles maintained in it being perfectly constitutional, that I am desirous of giving it this chance of going down to posterity.

The Bishop of Landaff's Speech in the House of Lords on the Regency Bill, January 22, 1789.

"My Lords,

"I WILL not trouble Your Lordships with a long speech, and I know not, indeed, whether I ought to trouble you with any, for I have not the presumption to think that it will be in my power much to illustrate a subject; which, as to a main part of it, has already received so ample a discussion on a former day. But I trust the House will forgive me, if I say, that I feel a singular satisfaction in being allowed an opportunity of delivering my sentiments, plainly and publicly, on as great a constitutional question as has ever been agitated in this House since the Revolution. I will endeavour to do this with as much perspicuity, with as much brevity, and with as much impartiality as possible.

"I will mispend no portion of Your Lordships' time, in deploring the sad necessity for this day's debate. The calamity with which the nation is afflicted would

have been a great one, had the monarch been a bad one; what it is now, may far more easily be conceived by you than expressed by me; for you would listen to me with impatience and disdain, if I undertook by reasoning to prove, what is felt by all, that it is one of the greatest which could have befallen us as a people. All ranks, all parties, all individuals, who have any knowledge of, any value for our constitution, agree in thinking that it is so; and all, I hope, unite in praying to Almighty God, to relieve us from it, by restoring our afflicted Sovereign to perfect sanity of body and mind.

" But, My Lords, till it shall please God to do this, my opinion is—I humbly submit it to the house, with that firmness which becomes an impartial enquirer after truth; but with that diffidence also which becomes a man frequently conscious of his inability to attain it; and who on every difficult question, whether of policy, of philosophy, or of religion, is by nature and habit more disposed to doubt than to dogmatize—my clear opinion is, that in the very outset of

this business, as soon as ever the two Houses of Parliament had, by solemn investigation, ascertained the single fact of the King's incapacity to govern the land, they ought to have empowered, (I beg, My Lords, it may be observed, that I question not the competency of the two houses to empower), His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, the next in blood to the throne, by a commission under the great seal or otherwise, to take upon him, not, I think, the whole regal power, (though that would have been a more legal and constitutional mode than what has been followed,) but the whole legislative authority of the King. The *legislature* being, by this *one* act of *necessity*, completed, and the constitution restored to its vigour, by the Prince of Wales presiding in parliament as his father's commissioner; the next step should have been for the parliament, I mean the complete parliament, to have appointed a Regent whom they thought fit, and with or without limitations as they thought fit: for though I think it would have been highly improper for the legislature to have appointed any

other person Regent, except the Prince of Wales, or to have appointed him Regent with any other check or control, except such as the constitution has thrown round the King himself in the exercise of his power, yet I admit in the fullest extent, that the legislature would have had both the power and the right to have done otherwise.

"A Regency being settled, not by the authority of the two Houses of Parliament, but by the whole legislature, the next step should have been, to have made the best possible provision for the guardianship of the King's person, for the security of his private property, and for his re-assumption of all his public rights of sovereignty, as soon as ever it shall please God to put him in a condition to enjoy them.

"This mode of proceeding would, I humbly think, have been the least perplexed, and the most constitutional which could have been followed. Another mode has been adopted, and limitations of the Regent's power have been proposed; and as I can neither approve of the mode in

which the limitations are proposed to be established, nor of the limitations themselves, I think it incumbent on me to state the reasons of my dissent.

"I begin, My Lords, with advancing a proposition which will be denied by none; the proposition is this, — that the monarchical power of a King of Great Britain is not an arbitrary but a fiduciary power; a trust committed by the community at large to one individual, to be exercised by him in obedience to the law of the land, and in certain cases according to his own discretion, but in subserviency to the public good. This proposition is one of the most fundamental principles of our constitution, and of every free constitution in the world. Its truth cannot be questioned, and, its truth being admitted, it *seems* to follow as a legitimate consequence, That whenever the individual, to whom the community has committed this trust, shall become incapable of executing it, the trust itself ought to revert to the community at large, to be by them delegated, *pro tempore*, to some other person for the same common end, the promo-

tion of the common welfare. It might otherwise happen, that one man's misfortune might become the occasion of all men's ruin. But if, during the present incapacity of the King, the trust which has been given to him, not for his benefit, but for the benefit of those who gave it to him, does in fact revert to the community, then may the community delegate, till the King's recovery, the whole or any part of that trust to whomsoever they think fit.

"Upon this or some such general ground of reasoning, I presume the proposition has been founded which maintains, that the Prince of Wales has no more right to the Regency previous to the designation of the two Houses of Parliament, (which may be supposed to represent the community at large,) than any other person.

"My Lords, I conceive this reasoning is not true; it would have been true had the law been absolutely silent as to what was to become of the trust, when he to whom it had been given became incapable of executing it: but the law is not silent on this point. In one case in which the King be-

comes incapable of executing the trust committed to him, the law has clearly and positively said, No, the trust shall not revert to the community at large; the community perfectly understand the mischief which would attend such a reversion; they will have nothing to do with it; it shall go according to an established order of succession, and it shall go entire to the heir. This is the express declaration of law, when the King becomes, by death, incapable of exercising the trust committed to him; and the analogy of law speaks precisely the same language in the present case; it says, No, the trust shall not revert to the community, it shall go *pro tempore*, and it shall go entire, to the next in succession to the Crown; it shall go to the Prince of Wales, who is of an age to receive, and of a capacity to execute the trust for the public good.

"I say not, My Lords, that the Prince of Wales has a legal right to the trust; but I do most firmly contend that he has such a title to it, as cannot be set aside without violating the strongest and most irrefraga-

ble analogy of law: and in what such analogy differs from law itself, I submit to Your Lordships' mature deliberation.

"We have heard much on this occasion of the word *right,* but no one has condescended to define it. Now if, with *Grotius,* we define Right, as applied to things, to be a moral power of possessing a thing in conformity to law, it is certain that the Prince of Wales can have no right to the regency; for the case has never occurred in our history, of a King being incapable of governing when an heir-apparent was of full age to govern, therefore there can be no unwritten law; and every body knows that there is no statute-law respecting the point; therefore there is no law, and where there is no law there can be no conformity to law, and where there is no conformity to law there can be no *right.* But if we define Right to be, a moral power of possessing a thing consistently with law; and if we admit that what is not forbidden by law is consistent with law, where is the law, written or unwritten, which forbids the Prince of Wales from exercising the execu-

tive government of the country during the incapacity of his father? It might, I think, be shewn that the law forbids every other person in the kingdom from doing this, but I doubt whether it could be shewn that it forbids the Prince of Wales. I beg pardon for troubling Your Lordships with these logical distinctions; yet on such distinctions depends clearness of ideas, on clearness of ideas depends closeness of argumentation, and on closeness of argumentation depends the investigation of truth. I will proceed to another argument.

"An old and venerable expositor of the common law instructs us to consider the King as composed of two bodies; one natural, subject to passions, and mortal; the other politic, subject to no passions, and immortal; an union of these two bodies constitutes a King; and he defines a demise of the crown to be a disunion or separation of the body politic of the King from his body natural. Admitting this definition of a demise to be a just one, and it is of too high authority for me at least to question it, I would argue thus:—Whenever there

is a separation of the body politic of the King, from the body natural of the King, there is a demise of the crown. But during the present indisposition of the King, there is a separation of the body politic of the King, from the body natural of the King; therefore during the present indisposition of the King there is a demise of the crown.

"My Lords, I should be ashamed in this place or in any place, on this occasion or on any occasion, to produce an argument which I did not think was founded in truth, and I do think that this argument is founded in truth; but that I may deal, as I ought to do, candidly and ingenuously with Your Lordships, I will state to the House wherein the weakness of this argument (if weakness it has any) consists; its weakness then, if it has any, consists in this,—That the great common lawyer to whom I have alluded had not probably, I say probably, for I cannot speak with certainty, when he gave the definition of a demise of the crown which I have mentioned, any other cause of the separation of the King's body politic from his body natural

in contemplation, except that which is occasioned by death. It rests with Your Lordships to determine whether the definition does not in *principle* extend further; I think it does.

"Thus if a King should become incapable of exercising the functions of a King, by being driven, for a time, from his throne, as happened to *Edward IV.*; or if he should become incapable by voluntarily abandoning the throne, as happened to *James II.*; or if he should be rendered incapable by the hand of God, as has happened to *George III.*;—in all these cases, and in cases such as these, there would be a *civil* demise of the crown. I know not whether the law-books acknowledge the terms *civil demise*, but I do know, that the ideas comprehended under these terms, are as perfectly intelligible as those which are comprehended under the terms *natural demise.*

"I am not, My Lords, here to be told that the throne is not vacant; I know that it is full, and that the powers of him who fills it are not dead but dormant, not extinguished but suspended; and therefore it

is that the demise I am contending for is not *natural* but *civil,* not *absolute* but *conditional,* not *permanent* but *temporary.*

" It is a maxim, we are told, in law—That the King never can become incompetent to the exercise of the kingly office. It is not my intention to question law-maxims, which are generally founded in great wisdom; but I must be allowed to say, that we are at this very moment denying in fact that integrity of kingship which we are establishing in words. For what is this politic capacity of the King which always remains entire, what but the capacity of executing the office of a King? It is that body politic of the King which is styled immortal. But in appointing a Regent, we certainly disunite the body politic of the King from his body natural, and we annex it for the time to the body natural of the Prince of Wales. Thus we, in fact, subvert the maxim of the law, on which so much verbal stress has been laid. This *civil demise* of the Crown, which I am firmly of opinion has now unhappily taken place, differs not, I think, from a natural demise as to the

quantum of power which ought to be transferred to the successor; but it differs from it as to the mode by which it is acquired, and as to the tenure by which it is held.

"Let us look at this matter in another, but not in a less interesting point of view. Was the kingdom a private estate, (I am far, My Lords, from considering kingdoms as private estates, which Kings may use or misuse, as each man may his private property, but it may for the present argument be considered as such,)—was, then, the kingdom a private estate, into whose hands could you so properly commit the management of the estate, during an incapacitating indisposition of the father, as into the hands of his eldest son, who had attained his full majority, and on whom the estate with all its appurtenances was strictly entailed? You might irritate and provoke the temper of such a son, and drive him to a wild and giddy negligence of his concerns, by showing a distrust of him, in not suffering him to have the sole and full management of that, which he of all others was most interested in the managing well. You might

degrade him in the estimation of the world, and debase him in his own opinion; but you would not do justice, believe me, My Lords, you would not do justice to those abilities which great occasions call forth, and exercise confirms; you would not cherish and invigorate those talents, which arduous situations and proper confidence never fail to produce in young and ingenuous minds.

"In a word, and to apply this,—Either the Prince of Wales is fit to be Regent of the kingdom with full regal power, during the present incapacity of the King, or he would not be fit to rule the land, were the King no more. But the law suffers us not to quibble and to dispute, and to introduce our partial distinctions, concerning the fitness or the unfitness of *a* Prince of Wales to rule the land when a King is no more; it tells us that he is fit. And the analogy of law tells us that he is fit to be Regent of the land with regal power, whilst the King continues to be incapable of exercising the functions of a King.

"In what I have hitherto advanced,

Your Lordships will observe that I have paid no attention to the precedents which have been so studiously collected, and in the application of which we have been told, by the highest authority of the law, that the whole matter consists. I have omitted the consideration of precedents, not only from being persuaded that their importance was sufficiently weighed in a former debate, but from a persuasion also, that, though there are some shades of resemblance between the present situation of the country, and its situation during the infancy of its kings, yet there are such strong lines of discrimination as sufficiently distinguish the two cases. But that I may not appear to assert this without proving it, I will advert for a moment to the precedent of Henry VI. during the infancy of that monarch, inasmuch as a peculiar degree of importance has been given to that precedent. But before I point out the difference of the two cases, I cannot help observing, and I make the observation with a degree of astonishment, that this boasted precedent

has not been followed in the only two points which were of consequence.

"What was done, My Lords, on the accession of Henry VI.? A commission was issued, by order of the privy council, under the Great Seal, appointing not any person, not any number of persons, but the next in blood to the King to convene a parliament, and to preside in the parliament when convened, in the name of and with the authority of the King. Has this been done now? No such thing. The parliament, when our King became incapable of governing, was convened; and, had the precedent of Henry VI. been followed, by order of the Council, or by order of the two Houses of Parliament, the Prince of Wales should have had a commission given him under the Great Seal, to preside in the parliament in the name of, and with the authority of the King.

"What was the next step which was taken in the reign of Henry VI.? A Regent was appointed by the authority of the *legislature*; that Regent was the Duke of

Gloucester, the person next in blood to the King, except the Duke of Bedford, who was not then in the kingdom; and he was controlled in the exercise of his power by a permanent Council. Has this been done now? No such thing. The Prince of Wales, the person next in blood to the King, is to be appointed Regent, but he is *not* to be appointed by the *legislature,* and he is *not* to be controlled by a Council.

"Could I have been of opinion, My Lords, that the proceedings during the infancy of Henry VI. ought to have been followed by the nation in the reign of George III., I would have placed my foot on the precedent I have been considering, as on a firm basis; I would have looked my country in the face, and boldly said,—The Prince of Wales is now restrained by a Council, because our ancestors restrained by such a Council, the Regent, in the reign of Henry VI. This would have been a manly proceeding; and a strict conformity to the precedent, might have been a degree of justification for having followed it. But to follow precedents, without a

reference to the times and circumstances under which they were made, is to follow blind guides, which will frequently lead us into error; and I have no difficulty in saying, that we ought not *now* to follow the precedent established in the reign of Henry VI.

"I admit that there is a similarity, or rather an identity, as to the fact of the incapacity for government in the two Kings, but in nothing else is there the least similitude. Henry VI. was an infant unknown to his subjects;—George III. is a monarch endeared to his subjects by a long reign. Henry VI. was born in a barbarous age; so far at least barbarous, that the constitution was unknown, and the succession unsettled;—George III. lives in an enlightened age, when our constitution is understood by almost every man we meet, and when no doubt remains respecting the succession to the Crown. Henry VI. was surrounded by ambitious nobles, whose adherents were so numerous, as to enable them to grapple with the King himself for the possession of the Crown;—George III.

is surrounded by nobles, whose adherents are not so numerous as to render them dangerous, not one of whom has the slightest pretensions to the Crown, and all of whom (My Lords, I know I speak truth) would sacrifice their lives and fortunes to keep the Crown on the head of him who wears it.

"But yet there is another distinction between the two cases, and it is a distinction of the utmost moment. I speak on this point with great diffidence. I oppose the avowed and declared sentiments of two noble Lords now in my eye, (Camden and Thurlow,) whose *legal* abilities are above my praise, and of whose discriminating faculties, on all subjects, I have a good opinion. I beg pardon of these great luminaries of the law beforehand. I am almost certain that I must be in an error, though I cannot see it.

"They have contended, then, that there is *no* difference as to the present argument between an *Heir Presumptive to Henry VI.* and an *Heir Apparent to George III.*; and I take the liberty to contend, that the dif-

ference in this case, and I consider no other, between an Heir Presumptive and an Heir Apparent, is *obvious* and *immense.* Henry VI., an infant of nine months or of nine years old, for it makes no difference as to the argument, (inasmuch as what was done respecting a Regency in the first year of his reign, was done for several years afterwards,) and the Heir Presumptive of Henry VI. stand on one part:—On the other, we are to consider George III., a King beyond the middle age, and the Heir Apparent, a man of twenty-seven. Now, My Lords, I will assume but this one *postulatum,* which, in all fairness of logical argumentation, cannot be denied me—that each of these four personages lives to the ordinary period of human life; then it is evident, that the Heir Presumptive of Henry VI. never can, by fair means, obtain the Crown; and that the Heir Apparent of George III. never can, by fair means, miss the Crown; and the difference between a certainty of never possessing, and a certainty of never failing to possess the Crown, is, in my humble opinion,

obvious and *immense.* It is a difference, too, so important in its nature and consequences, as to render the restrictions of the Regent's power, in the person of the Heir Presumptive of Henry VI., perfectly inapplicable to the Regency of the Heir Apparent of George III. I have done with the precedents, and will proceed to the consideration of the restrictions which are proposed.

"It is said, then, that in the establishment of a Regency, no more power ought to be given to the Regent, than what is sufficient to enable him to carry on the executive government of the country with effect, for the public good. My Lords, I admit this proposition in its full extent; and it is on the truth of this proposition that I ground my argument, for there being *no* restrictions put upon the Regent. All the regal power is necessary to enable him to carry on the government for the public good. What! is it asserted or insinuated, that the King himself has an atom more of regal power belonging to him by the constitution of the country, than what is sufficient to enable him to carry on the

government of the country with effect, for the public good? I contend that he has no such power; such a power would be a power to do wrong, and the King has no moral power to do wrong; it would be that *injuriæ licentia,* which is the basis of tyranny in every kingdom of the world; it is that which the despots of the continent claim and exercise; which our Monarch, thank God! we are certain, would not exercise, could he claim it, but which *our constitution, thank God! does not suffer him to claim.*

"But it is objected—if you give the whole regal power to the Regent, you make him not a Regent, but a King; you dethrone the Monarch, and place the crown of George III. on the head of George IV. These, My Lords, are high-sounding words; but I have not been accustomed to pay attention to words, beyond the sense they contain, and I do not see that these contain any. The whole regal power is requisite for the Regent, because it is requisite for the common good, that the whole regal power should have an existence somewhere.

But though you give the Regent the whole regal power, you will not make him a King; he will differ essentially from a King in this,—that he exercises his power in the name of another. Every public instrument which he sets his hand to, announces to every man in the kingdom, that the Crown still rests on the head of his father. He will differ, too, from a King in another point, in what is the most essential point of royalty,—in permanency of possession.

" But it is contended in particular, that the power of creating Peers should not be given to the Regent. What! is this high prerogative, then, useless or pernicious to the state? No, it will be said, it is a prerogative productive of public good, when exercised by a King; but productive of public mischief, when exercised by a Regent. My Lords, there is no manner of foundation for this reasoning, when the Regent is the Heir Apparent. There might be some foundation for it, was the Queen the Regent; was the Duke of York the Regent; and much more, was any other person the Regent; because every other

person in the kingdom, except the Heir Apparent, might be supposed to have a private interest, diverse from, and opposite to the public good. Peers might be made in attention to this private interest; but this cannot be supposed concerning *a* Prince of Wales. To say that *a* Prince of Wales can have any interest in view distinct from the public interest, is to say that he is absolutely unfit for the government of the country,—an assertion not more reprobated by the law, than, without meaning any flattery to His Royal Highness, I believe it to be false in fact.

"But, it has been said, if the Prince of Wales is allowed the power of making peers, he may infringe the rights of the reigning monarch, and the King, on his return to his parliament, may find this House filled with the friends of the Prince of Wales, and with the enemies of the reigning Sovereign. Good God! My Lords, is it possible that so uncandid and illiberal a suspicion—I wish to avoid asperity of language—a suspicion so ill founded and so injurious to the characters of both the high

personages alluded to, should ever have entered into the heart of any man in Great Britain? The virtues of the reigning Monarch have left him no enemies in any part of his dominions; and it is but common justice to the Prince of Wales, that justice which every one of Your Lordships would wish in similar circumstances to be done to his own son, to place this confidence in the Prince of Wales, that he will have no friends but the friends of his family and of the constitution. And is it not to fix an opprobrious, and, we all know, an undeserved stigma on the character of the King, to say, that on his recovery he will be sorry to meet in this House, or in any place, the friends of his family and of the constitution?

"A distinction, My Lords, has of late years arisen in this kingdom which I much dislike; it is a distinction not founded in nature, it is pregnant with mischief, and may bring forth civil discord; a distinction, into *King's friends*, and *Prince's friends*. I learned at school that friendship subsists not *nisi inter pares*; and my station in society is

far too humble to permit me to affect a parity with kings and princes. I have no ambition to be ranked among the King's friends, none to be ranked among the Prince of Wales's friends: but I have an ambition, I have had it through life, and I shall carry it to my grave with me,—it is an ambition to be ranked among the friends of the whole house of Brunswick, and why, My Lords? not from any private regard, but because the house of Brunswick is a friend to the civil and religious liberties of mankind; because, if we may augur concerning the future from an experience of the past, *the house of Brunswick will ever continue to be friends to the constitution of the country as defined and established at the Revolution.*

"It is proposed to confide to the Prince of Wales the high prerogative of declaring war and making peace; of entering into foreign treaties which bind the nation, and must bind the King himself on his recovery; of directing the operations of the standing army; of appointing to all offices, (the household excepted,) civil and mili-

tary. These and other prerogatives of a similar nature, on a due and discreet use of which every thing that is dear to us as men and citizens depends, are to be intrusted (and the trust we have no reason to think will be misplaced) to the Prince of Wales. Having given so much, where is the wisdom of retaining the rest? where is the wisdom of depriving the Regent of the ability of rewarding merit, and of enabling *his* ministers to strengthen themselves in *administration*, by exactly the same means whereby their political competitors will have strengthened themselves in *opposition?* My Lords, there may be public grounds for this restriction; and, considering the characters of those who have been concerned in framing it, it would be uncandid in me to say there *are* none, but I must profess that I *see* none.

"But were the public grounds for this limitation more obvious and more extensive than any person will assert them to be, still I would not vote either for the limitation itself, or for the mode of establishing it. No, My Lords, never shall it

be said of me that I concurred in violating the constitution of my country, by allowing to the two Houses of Parliament, either the right of legislating, or of suspending, though but for an hour, any portion of the royal prerogative. The established prerogative of the Crown is a part of the common law of the land, and I think that the two Houses of Parliament have no more right to suspend the law than the King has. The constitution is violated, let the suspension be made by any power short of that which made the law. If the two Houses can suspend indefinitely, they may abolish perpetually. If they can abolish, as useless to the common safety, one prerogative, why not another; why not all?—Why may they not come to a resolution, that all the prerogatives of the Crown, and that the King himself, are as useless to the public good, as this House was formerly declared to be by the other!

"I know, My Lords, it has been said by my enemies, that I am a friend to republican principles, and I question not they will be greedy in embracing this opportunity of

saying, that I am a friend to prerogative principles. *I have hitherto disdained, and I shall continue to disdain, giving a reply to my calumniators of any kind; but I feel it an happiness, and I think it an honour to declare to this numerous assembly of Your Lordships, that I am no friend to republican principles, none to prerogative principles, none to aristocratic principles, but a warm, zealous, and determined friend to that equilibrium of the three powers, on the preservation of which depends the conservation of the finest constitution (not perfect, perhaps, either with respect to its civil or ecclesiastical part, for what human thing is perfect?), but yet the finest civil constitution that ever blessed mankind on the surface of the globe.* For the preservation of this constitution I would lay down my life; the expression is a strong one, but the occasion justifies it; for in doing so, I should think that I fulfilled the most important duty of a man and of a citizen, that I performed a service acceptable to the Supreme Being, in contributing to continue to millions yet unborn the blessing of the British constitution. With these senti-

ments concerning the excellence, and with the apprehensions which I now entertain of the violation of the constitution, Your Lordships will, I trust, forgive the warmth and the firmness with which I speak.

"I cannot sit down without adverting to an important point, the arrangement of the household. If we were to follow the cool conclusions of dispassionate reasoning, the most proper mode of proceeding, whether we respect the circumstances of the country or the state of the civil list itself, would be to extinguish that part of the household which is useless to the King in his present unhappy circumstances, and to save the expense of its establishment. But as it often happens in private life, that our feelings are in opposition to our judgment, so has it happened to myself on this occasion. I do feel a reluctance to the abolishing any part of the royal household whilst there remains any hope of the King's recovery. I wish His Majesty on his recovery to feel, not the shadowy comfort of seeing the same faces about his person, but the solid comfort of knowing, that his subjects had not out of a selfish regard

THE TANJORE

for themselves, seized the opportunity of his misfortune to tarnish the splendor, and to diminish the dignity of royalty.

"But though I wish not the household to be diminished, and though it is useless, as to the greatest part of it, to the King, I would not have it continue useless to the public; it ought to be transferred to the Regent. The *phaleræ* of royalty are calculated, not merely to captivate the vulgar, but to render the person of the King venerable in the eyes of all, that his office may thereby be executed with greater advantage to the public. Subordination is necessary to the very existence of civil society, and whatever has a tendency to preserve it, in a due degree, is a public good. For the same reason that the state is at the expense of adorning the person and situation of the Monarch by a splendid household, it ought to adorn the person and situation of the Regent. It is not to swell the vanity of either the King or the Regent that this is done, but to render the chief magistrate respectable in the contemplation of those over whom his magistracy extends.

"As to the influence which attends the household, it ought not, perhaps, to be permitted to exist at all; but whilst it does in fact exist, it certainly ought not to be dissevered from the executive government. It is a great doubt with me, whether *the influence of the Crown be not too great; but I have no doubt in saying, that the influence ought not to subsist any where but in the Crown.* But I will not dwell upon this, for I agree with the noble Lord who opened the debate, that we ought not to refer to the characters of the great personages to whom we have occasion to allude; if this were allowable I would say, that I think so well of the Queen, as to be under no manner of apprehension that she will ever put herself at the head of a party in opposition to the government of her son.

"My Lords, I have delivered the real sentiments of my heart, without any respect to party; I am not a party man; this is not a question of party, nor ought it to be considered as such. The question is not whether this or that man shall be the minister of the country. If that had been

the question, I would have said to every *independent* member of this House, (and therefore, for the credit of human nature, and for the dignity of the peerage, I would have supposed that I addressed myself to every *individual* in it,) in the language of ancient Rome,—*Non agitur de publico commodo, sed utrum Cæsar an Pompeius possideat rempublicam. Quid tibi M. Cato cum istâ contentione?*

"No, My Lords, the question is, in what manner shall we maintain unviolated the principles of the constitution, protect the dormant rights of the reigning Monarch, do justice to the legal claims, to the reasonable expectations at least of the Heir Apparent, provide for the domestic tranquillity, confirm and extend the foreign importance of the kingdom? This is the complex and important question which solicits your decision: I, for one, as a member of this House, and as a bishop of this realm, lay my hand upon my heart, and say in the most solemn manner, That, in my judgment, we shall best promote these great ends by appointing His Royal Highness

the Prince of Wales and Heir Apparent to the Crown, Regent, with full regal power.

"However different many of Your Lordships may be from me in this sentiment, I will conclude with a wish, in which I am certain of being joined by all who hear me, and was the Heir Apparent himself in the House, I am confident that his piety as a son, that his duty as a subject, (of both of which he has on this trying occasion given such exemplary proof,) would make him the first to unite with me in a wish, an hope, a prayer, that a speedy and *perfect* restoration of the King's health may put an early period to the Regency of his son."

I had great confidence in the justness of the reasoning of this speech, from observing that the Chancellor, in his reply, paid me, in his coarse way, a reluctant compliment in saying, "The Bishop has given us his advice, and I know not but that something may be made on't." And from being told by the Duke of Portland, on the same night in which I spoke, "that it was looked upon, by at least one side of the House, as

the best which had been produced in either House of Parliament."

The Chancellor, in his reply, boldly asserted that he perfectly well remembered the passage I had quoted from *Grotius*, and that it solely respected natural, but was inapplicable to civil rights. Lord Loughborough, the first time I saw him after the debate, assured me, that before he went to sleep that night he had looked into *Grotius*, and was astonished to find that the Chancellor, in contradicting me, had presumed on the ignorance of the House, and that my quotation was perfectly correct.—What miserable shifts do great men submit to in supporting their parties! The Chancellor Thurlow was an able and upright judge, but as the Speaker of the House of Lords he was domineering and insincere. It was said of him, that in the cabinet he opposed every thing, proposed nothing, and was ready to support any thing. I remember Lord Camden's saying to me one night, when the Chancellor was speaking contrary, as I thought, to his own conviction, "There now, I could not do that; he is sup-

porting what he does not believe a word of."

Lord Cathcart had attempted to answer my speech, on the day after I had spoken it, and he thought fit to send me the following letter:—

"Clifford-street, January 27, 1789.

"My Lord,

"In the course of what I endeavoured to state to the House last night, I wished to take some notice of parts of Your Lordship's speech. I conceived that the debate was adjourned from the preceding day, and that therefore, in point of order, I had a right so to do. The arrangement and perspicuity of Your Lordship's argument tempted me to wish to follow it as far as I was able, and by the boldness of that attempt to attract the attention of the Lords to what I had to offer to the House on those subjects.

"To one not in the habit of speaking in public, it requires a considerable exertion to address the House of Lords; the Lords were coming in and taking their places,

and not having had any previous design of speaking at that particular period of the debate, I confess I soon found myself under the influence of the most overcoming embarrassment, to which I hope Your Lordship will have the goodness to attribute the clumsy manner in which, I fear, I made over frequent allusions to Your Lordship's speech, without being able sufficiently to mark the respect with which I wished these allusions to be accompanied. This apprehension has induced me to trouble Your Lordship with this letter.

"I beg leave to assure you, My Lord, that I have not forgot the obligation which the Peers of Scotland owe to your Lordship, for the part you had the goodness to take in our behalf, on a very interesting question which materially affected the rights of the Peers of Scotland; but I beg leave also to assure Your Lordship, that that support is by no means the sole foundation of that respect and regard, with which I have the honour to be, My Lord,

"Your Lordship's most obedient
"humble servant,
"CATHCART."

I had not the least acquaintance with Lord Cathcart, and returned by his messenger the following answer:

"My Lord,

"I am sorry Your Lordship has had the trouble of writing to me on the subject of what passed yesterday in the House of Lords. The arguments I used on a former day are entirely at Your Lordship's service, and at that of every other noble Lord, to be commented upon at any time, and in any manner which may be thought fit; if they will not bear the test of every examination, so far from wishing them to influence the judgment of other men, they shall not continue to influence my own. As to what Your Lordship seemed to apprehend, my having spoken disrespectfully of the Peers of Scotland, I do beg leave to assure Your Lordship, that you had totally misconceived my meaning on the occasion; there is not a man in England who thinks more respectfully of the talents and spirit of the Scots Peers than I do.

"Permit me the liberty of saying, that I

take nothing amiss that fell from Your Lordship yesterday; my temper is neither irascible nor revengeful; in my own mind I honourably acquitted Your Lordship, even at the time you were speaking, of any design to misrepresent me, and I am convinced that, in doing so, I did no more than justice to Your Lordship's honour and character.

"I am, &c.

"R. LANDAFF."

The following is a letter to the Duke of Grafton, in answer to one in which he had politely hinted at my having voted in opposition to the minister. I was then happy, and have since then continued to be so, in the Duke of Grafton's friendship; I thought it therefore proper to let him know at once the nature of our connexion as to public matters.

"Great George-st. Jan. 12, 1789.

"My dear Lord Duke,

"YOUR Grace's kind invitation to Euston followed me to this place. Mrs. Watson

and my family will be in town on Thursday, so that it will be impossible for me to have the pleasure of waiting upon you at Euston.

"As to politics, I have but one rule for my public conduct; to vote according to the best of my judgment upon every occasion, and, when I cannot form a judgment, not to vote at all. It will always be a sensible mortification to me to differ from Your Grace, but I trust we neither of us are of a temper to let a difference on public questions break in upon the comforts of private attachments.

"I think I have been miserably neglected by Mr. Pitt, and I feel the indignity as I ought; but this feeling would not have hindered me from supporting him on the present occasion, had I approved his measures.

"I know perfectly well the personal indiscretion of pretending to think for myself on political subjects, and how much a man who does so is traduced, ridiculed, and contemned by all parties; but I cannot do otherwise.

"To be overlooked by Mr. Pitt, or by any other minister, for want of character or ability in my profession, would cover me with shame; it would be a silly affectation in me to say, that I feel any uneasiness on that account, when I compare myself with the rest of my brethren; but to be overlooked for want of political pliancy, is a circumstance I need not blush to own, and let the consequence be what it may, I shall never lament it.

"I am, &c.

"R. Landaff."

The restoration of the King's health soon followed. It was the artifice of the minister to represent all those who had opposed *his* measures, as enemies to the King; and the Queen lost, in the opinion of many, the character which she had hitherto maintained in the country, by falling in with the designs of the minister. She imprudently distinguished by different degrees of courtesy on the one hand, and by meditated affronts on the other, those who had voted with, and those who had voted

against the minister, insomuch that the Duke of Northumberland one day said to me, "So, My Lord, you and I also are become traitors."

She received me at the drawing-room, which was held on the King's recovery, with a degree of coldness, which would have appeared to herself ridiculous and ill placed, could she have imagined how little a mind such as mine regarded, in its honourable proceedings, the displeasure of a woman, though that woman happened to be a Queen.

The Prince of Wales, who was standing near her, then asked me to dine with him, and on my making some objection to dining at Carlton House, he turned to Sir Thomas Dundas, and desired him to give us a dinner, at his house, on the following Saturday. Before we sat down to dinner on that day, the Prince took me aside, explained to me the principle on which he had acted during the whole of the King's illness, and spoke to me, with an afflicted

JOBE

feeling, of the manner in which the Queen had treated himself. I must do him the justice to say, that he spoke in this conference, in as sensible a manner as could possibly have been expected from an heir apparent to the throne, and from a son of the best principles towards both his parents. I advised him to persevere in dutifully bearing with his mother's ill humour, till time and her own good sense should disentangle her from the web which ministerial cunning had thrown around her.

Having thought well of the Queen, I was willing to attribute her conduct, during the agitation of the Regency question, to her apprehensions of the King's safety, to the misrepresentations of the King's minister, to any thing rather than to a fondness for power.

Before we rose from table at Sir Thomas Dundas's, where the Duke of York and a large company were assembled, the conversation turning on parties, I happened to say that I was sick of parties, and should

retire from all public concerns—"No," said the Prince, "and mind who it is that tells you so, you shall never retire; a man of your talents shall never be lost to the public."—I have now lived many years in retirement, and, in my seventy-fifth year, I feel no wish to live otherwise.

On occasion of the duel between the Duke of York and Colonel Lennox, I find that I wrote the following note to Lord Rawdon, who had been the Duke's second, and of whose high honour and eminent talents I always entertained the best opinion:—

"Cambridge, May 28, 1789.

"My dear Lord,

"I KNOW you will forgive the liberty I take in requesting you to present, in the most respectful manner, to the Duke of York, my warmest congratulations on a late event.

"As a Christian bishop I cannot approve of any man's exposing his life on such an occasion. As a citizen I must think that

the life of one so near to the Crown ought not to be hazarded like the life of an ordinary man; but as a friend to the House of Brunswick, I cannot but rejoice in the personal safety, and in the personal gallantry too, of so distinguished a branch of it.

"I am, &c.

"R. LANDAFF."

The dismission of the Duke of Queensberry and Lord Lothian from their offices, and the treatment which Lord Rodney and others received on account of their having voted in the business of the Regency against the minister, finished Mr. Pitt's character, for public consistency, with me. I had believed him to have been as sincere as I was in wishing for the independency of parliament; but I now perceived that he wished to have it as subservient to his own views as possible, and cared little for the constitution of the country, whilst he preserved his own power, verifying the observation of *Helvetius*,—"*L'amour de l'homme pour le pouvoir est tel, qu'en Angleterre même il n'est presque point de ministre qui ne voulût*

revêtir son Prince du pouvoir arbitraire. L'ivresse d'une grande place fait oublier au ministre qu'accablé lui-même sous le poids du pouvoir qu'il édifie, lui et sa postérité en seront peut-être les premières victimes."

Numberless addresses were presented to the King and Queen, on the recovery of His Majesty; I drew up the two following, and sent them to be signed by the clergy of my diocese, before they were presented:—

"Most Gracious Sovereign,

"We, the Bishop, Archdeacon and Chapter, and Clergy, of the diocese of Landaff, Your Majesty's most dutiful subjects, humbly, and with hearty thanksgivings to Almighty God, beg leave to congratulate Your Majesty on the recovery which He, in his mercy, hath vouchsafed to you from a long and singularly afflicting indisposition. We are persuaded, that no congratulations, on any occasion, were ever offered to any of Your Majesty's predecessors with more cordial sincerity and

more perfect unanimity than those will be, which a free, a loyal, and an affectionate people will present to Your Majesty, on this event. It is an event highly interesting to every branch of Your Majesty's family, and to every friend of the House of Brunswick. The happiness of men, who have the misfortune to live under despotic governments, depends more on the good disposition of their ruler, than on the nature of their civil constitution; whilst that of men, who live under free governments, is more dependent on the principles of their constitution, than on the virtues of their Prince. How happy, then, may our situation justly be esteemed! We certainly live under the best form of civil government that was ever established in the world; and we have the comfort of knowing, that it is administered by a King whose virtues, public and private, would render even despotism itself not destructive of the happiness of human kind.

"May God, in his good providence, long continue to us the blessing of Your Majesty's life and health, and preserve, to our

latest posterity, the blessing of the British constitution."

I am so little conversant with the manners of a court, that I know not whether to refer the following letter to the order of the King, or to the spontaneous courtesy of the Secretary of State from whom I received it.

"Whitehall, 13th April, 1789.

"My Lord,

"I HAVE this day had the honour of presenting to the King the Address of the Archdeacon and Chapter, and Clergy of the diocese of Landaff, which Your Lordship transmitted to me, congratulating His Majesty on the happy re-establishment of his health; and I have the satisfaction of informing you that His Majesty was pleased to receive the same in the most gracious manner.

"I have the honor to be, My Lord,

"Your Lordship's most obedient humble servant,

"SYDNEY."

Address to the Queen.

"Most Gracious Queen,

"We the Bishop, Archdeacon and Chapter, and Clergy of the diocese of Landaff, entreat Your Majesty graciously to accept our congratulations on the King's recovery from his late indisposition; they are tendered to Your Majesty with the utmost truth.

"The comforts of domestic life are natural and sincere; all persons, in all ranks, equally feel the importance of possessing them, are equally affected by their interruption or loss. We firmly believe that every family in the kingdom sympathized with Your Majesty in your late distress, and that they all participate in your present felicity.

"Sensible of the influence of Royal example, we have always thought that Your Majesty was entitled to the thanks of the kingdom for the proofs you have uniformly given, during a long residence amongst us, of the sincerity of your piety, of the amiableness and purity of your manners as a

Queen, as a wife, and as a mother. But if Your Majesty could have claimed our regard on no other account, the tenderness and concern you have shown for a beloved Monarch during his late unhappy situation, would have secured to you the grateful attachment of a loyal people.

"We observed, in the deliberations of parliament, a great diversity of opinion as to the most *constitutional mode* of protecting the Rights of the Sovereign during the continuance of his indisposition; but we observed no diversity whatever as to the *necessity* of protecting them in the most effectual manner. This circumstance cannot fail of giving solid satisfaction to Your Majesty; for next to the consolation of believing that, in his recovery, he has been the especial object of God's mercy, must be that of knowing, that, during his illness, he was the peculiar object of his people's love; that he reigns over a free, a great, and an enlightened nation, not more by the laws of the land than by the wishes of his people."

The first part of this last paragraph, I knew, would be disagreeable to the Queen, as it contradicted the principle she wished to be generally believed, and the truth of which could alone justify her conduct—that the opposition to the minister was an opposition to the King. Now as there was not a word of disaffection to the King, in any of the debates in either House of Parliament, during the transaction of the Regency, and (as I verily believe) the hearts of the opposition were as warm with the King, and warmer with the constitution, than those of their competitors, I thought fit to say what was, in my judgment, the plain truth.

About this time, hearing that my old friend (Preston), then Bishop of Ferns, was dangerously ill in Ireland, I felt my regard for him (which had been lessened by his acceptance of a bishoprick) returning with all its force, and I wrote the following letter to him:—

"Cambridge, April 6, 1789.

"My dear Lord,

"You have never written to me since

you went to Ireland; I know nothing of you except by report. I cannot, however, suffer an ardent friendship, of many years standing, to cool so suddenly, as not to be greatly interested in what I hear of you, and they tell me that you are ill, and dangerously ill. If the fact is so, and you think that my consolation can be of use to you, command me in any way and to any extent you judge fit. Some twenty years ago you were then, I believe, at Vienna; I preferred your interest to my own, in soliciting for you the Professorship of Modern History, and you wrote me word, that you should die contented in having met with a true friend; that friend is still what he was then, and though both our situations are mended, yet the principle of regard remains the same.

"I am, &c.

"I ought not to give you advice, for you have not consulted me; and if you had, our feelings may be different, but nothing should induce me to imbitter the rest of my life in the squabbles of a college."

It was then reported that Preston was to have been translated to an English bishoprick, and to have been made Master of Trinity College.

The tract which I had last year given to the young persons of my diocese was this year published, and a large edition was soon sold. I have been told that the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, if I would have given them the tract, intended to have printed an edition of ten thousand copies, and to have distributed it *gratis*; and my information was probably correct, for Bishop Barrington had before asked me to let the Society have the tract, but it was then sold to my bookseller. If I had, in due time, known the intention of the Society respecting this little publication, no price should have purchased it; but I did not think so highly of it, as to suppose it merited the distinction intended for it. A year or two afterwards the Society applied to me for leave to print a part of it; this I refused, (though I gave them leave to print the whole, having

settled the matter with my bookseller,) not believing that there was a word wrong in any part of it. I understood that Bishop Horseley objected to some expressions in it, and, after a great deal of absurd violence on his part, prevailed upon the Society not to agree to the printing of the whole of it. What it was that the Bishop objected to I thought it beneath me to inquire, either directly or indirectly. His political principles were to me detestable, and his theology too dogmatical, though he was certainly a man of talents.

About ten years after the publication of this tract, the following passage in it was animadverted upon by a person wholly unknown to me, (Mr. Ashdown of Canterbury,) in two short letters, addressed to the Bishop of Landaff:—" The Holy Spirit we KNOW gave his assistance in an extraordinary manner to the first preachers of the Gospel, and they were sure of his *dwelling in them*, by the power of speaking with new tongues, and by the other gifts which he distributed to them. We THINK we

have the authority of Scripture for saying, that God still continues to *work in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure;* to give his *Holy Spirit to them that ask him;* but the manner in which the Holy Spirit gives his assistance to faithful and pious persons is not attended with any certain signs of its being given; it is secret and unknown; you cannot distinguish the working, by which he *helpeth your infirmities,* from the ordinary operations of your own minds." Mr. Ashdown contends that the distinction of ordinary and extraordinary operations of the Holy Spirit is not founded in Scripture; and that, if it should be admitted to be founded in Scripture, yet that both operations ceased with the apostolic age. I made no reply to Mr. Ashdown's pamphlet, for my judgment was not decided on the point. An attentive reader might have inferred my indecision, from adverting to the different import of the words, we *know,* and we *think.* I am not ashamed to own, that I give a greater degree of assent to the doctrine of the extraordinary operation of the Spirit in the age of the Apostles, than I do to that

of his immediate influence, either by illumination or sanctification, in succeeding ages. Notwithstanding this confession, I am not prepared to say, that the latter is an unscriptural doctrine; future investigation may clear up this point, and God, I trust, will pardon me an indecision of judgment proceeding from an inability of comprehension. If it shall ever be shown that the doctrine of the *ordinary* operation of the Holy Ghost is not a Scripture doctrine, Methodism, Quakerism, and every degree of enthusiasm will be radically extinguished in the Christian church; men, no longer believing, that God does that by more means which may be done by fewer, will wholly rely for religious *instruction*, consequent *conversion*, and subsequent *salvation*, on his *Word*.—*Cum audiamus, Deum omnem ut convertendi homines ita sanctificandi rationem sic adstrinxisse verbo suo, ut per id solum, tanquam per instrumentum et medium opus, utrumque perageretur; hâc lege et institutione divinâ omnis de immediatâ spiritus operatione cogitatio plane prosternitur.*—Doederlein, Institut. Theol. vol. ii. p. 646.

Before I left town this year, I called upon the Dutchess of Rutland; we had some conversation on politics; she was warm in support of a party, and that party was Mr. Pitt's; I told her that I would not attach myself to any party; she replied, with prophetic verity, you will then die a martyr to both parties. I sent Her Grace the subjoined letter, the day I went out of London:—

"London, April 3, 1789.

"Dear Lady Dutchess,

"I WILL not leave town without saying a word to you on the subject of our last conversation; for there is no person for whom I have a greater regard, or whose good opinion I more esteem. I am vexed when I see you forming an improper judgment on any occasion, and especially if my conduct is the object of your consideration. I referred you to my publications for an explication of my principles, but I will spare you the trouble of looking into the book I had the honour to send you last year, by making a few extracts from it.

"P. 120.—'He, who from apprehension or expectation, from gratitude or resentment, from any worldly motive, speaks or acts contrary to his decided judgment, in supporting or in opposing any particular system of politics, is guilty of a great sin, the sad consequences of which no worldly interest can compensate.'

"P. 121.—'Probity is an uniform principle; it cannot be put on in our private closet and put off in the Council Chamber or the Senate; and it is no inconsiderable part of probity to speak with boldness, and to act with firmness according to the dictates of conscience.'

"P. 410.—'If there be any one measure more likely than another to preserve pure and unblemished the honour of the Crown, I verily believe it to be the establishing, as much as possible, the independency of the several members of both Houses of Parliament.'

"My conduct has been correspondent to these principles. I told the Duke of Rutland, I told Mr. Pitt, and I have told every other great man, with whom I have

had connexions, that I would do so; that in great political questions I would not follow the lead of any party, but the dictates of my own judgment. Four great questions have been agitated during Mr. Pitt's administration; in two I have supported him, and in two I have opposed him. I supported Mr. Pitt's Irish Propositions, because I thought them useful both to England and Ireland: I opposed his Commercial Treaty with France, because I thought the French were not sincere, and that the treaty would do us no good. I gave in parliament the most explicit approbation to his Treaty with Holland, and said that he deserved the thanks of his country for having made it; because I thought it, and still think it, the best measure of his administration: I opposed him on the present occasion, because I thought he was injuring the principles of the constitution. I perfectly knew that it would have been for my interest to have given an insincere approbation of the measures I opposed; but my spirit disdained the duplicity, and my principles abhorred it.

...ATI MAHAL...

"I have followed a similar conduct in private life, and I beg you to consider, whether you have not had an instance of it in your own family. You are sensible that I never paid your poor Duke any particular attention, except when I could serve him; and yet I know the effect of such attentions, in conciliating a great man's patronage and regard. I often thwarted his propensities, by giving him advice, which I knew would disgust him; and yet I was well aware of the consequences of such disgust. Lord Mansfield requested me to do what I could, to stop him in his career of play; because, he said, he would soon become a beggar: disregarding the displeasure I might incur, I did what I could; and I remember concluding a letter I wrote to him, on his appointment to Ireland, with saying, 'Let me beseech you, as you respect your future character and consequence in life, as you love your Dutchess and your children, not to suffer the Castle at Dublin to become another Brookes's to you.'

"Such have been my principles, and

such my conduct, both in public and private life; and if for these I am to be abandoned by my friends, and proscribed the emoluments of my profession (to the highest of which there are who think, that the Bishop of Landaff has as honourable and as professional a claim as any of his brethren,) the misfortune may fall on me and my family, but the dishonour must rest with others.

"I write this to *you*, because I wish *you* not to be ignorant of the motives of my conduct; but I will never condescend to give a word of explanation to Mr. Pitt. I have rendered him some services, and many civilities, and at times when both were of importance to him; but I never experienced from him the least return of either. The cause of this neglect is quite unknown to me. If my parliamentary independence is the cause, I can only say that it must remain for ever; and that Mr. Pitt is destitute of that magnanimity, and, considering his professions respecting the reform of parliament, of that political integrity too, of which I once thought him possessed.

MAHARAJA SERFOGI'S SARAS

"You will blame me for this loftiness of spirit, and your friendship for me will make you regret that I cannot subdue it; but I feel that it springs from a root of honour, and I will not attempt to subdue it.

"You need not have the trouble of answering this; I have no doubt of the continuance of your regard for me; and I trust we both of us have too elevated sentiments to suffer the madness of politics to deaden on either side the activity of friendship. I stay at Cambridge till the middle of June, and then go into Westmoreland for four or five months; there, in all places, you may rest assured of my warmest attachment to yourself and your children.

"R. Landaff."

Towards the latter end of the same month, Mr. Stewart, a son of Lord Cardiff, and a very amiable young man, waited upon me at Cambridge to ask my opinion relative to his becoming a candidate to represent the University of Cambridge at the next general election. Had I been of that little and revengeful mind which disgraced

Mr. Pitt, by whom I had been so repeatedly neglected, I should certainly have embraced the opportunity which was now presented to me, of raising an opposition to him; for my encouragement of Mr. Stewart would quickly have produced one. On the contrary, I assured Mr. Stewart that I thought Mr. Pitt (notwithstanding I had no private reason to be pleased with him) a very proper person to represent the University; and that as to his colleague, Lord Euston, I would not suffer his accidental difference in politics from me, to lessen, for a moment, my private friendship for him: in a word, I informed Mr. Stewart, that he must not entertain any hopes of my assistance. He asked me if he might tell the Duke of Portland so. I told him that he certainly might, for that, though I had a great regard for the Duke of Portland's Whig principles, and had taken part with the opposition in the Regency transaction, I would not unite myself to any party beyond the direct influence of my own judgment in public measures; and that private friendship was too sacred a thing to be

abandoned for the purposes of changeable policy. Mr. Stewart behaved perfectly well on hearing this declaration, and the intended opposition was given up.

In 1789, Mr. Howard published, in a large quarto volume, an account of the principal Lazarettos in Europe, and honoured me (though personally unknown to him) with a copy of it, in which he had written, with his own hand,—"Mr. Howard presents his best respects to the Lord Bishop of Landaff, and requests his acceptance of this book, as a small testimony of his esteem." I am not ashamed to own that such an encomium from such a man, was highly acceptable to me, having always considered the esteem of good men as the strongest incentive to virtuous exertion, and its fittest reward.

I pursued my intention of retiring, in a great measure, from public life, and laid, in the summer of 1789, the foundation of my house on the banks of the Winandermere. I have now spent above twenty

years in this delightful country; but my time has not been spent in field-diversions, in idle visitings, in county bickerings, in indolence or intemperance: no, it has been spent, partly in supporting the religion and constitution of the country by seasonable publications; and principally in building farm-houses, blasting rocks, enclosing wastes, in making bad land good, in planting larches, and in planting in the hearts of my children principles of piety, of benevolence, and of self-government. By such occupations I have much recovered my health, entirely preserved my independence, set an example of a spirited husbandry to the county, and honourably provided for my family.

The Duke of Grafton published in the course of the spring (1789) a pamphlet entitled, "Hints to the New Association," and recommending a revisal of our Liturgy, &c. Notwithstanding the intimacy with which I then lived with His Grace, I knew nothing of this pamphlet, nor who was the author of it, for his name was not put to it till several months after it had been published. When I did know who was the

author, I greatly rejoiced that a person of his rank had ventured to propose a reform in one of the points respecting the Church, which I had long ago recommended.

In February, 1790, two pamphlets were published in opposition to the Duke's Hints. I wrote an hasty reply to these attacks upon a nobleman whose zeal for christianity, instead of censure and obloquy, deserved the praise of all good men. I took a large and liberal view of the subject, thinking it better to do that, than to give a printed answer to every petulant remark of the two pamphleteers, though one of them, I have no doubt, was the production of a bishop, if not both. In this tract I had said, that the French government, in order to secure its stability, might, perhaps, think it expedient to pay from the public purse, not only Catholic but Protestant teachers of Christianity. This wise and equitable measure was adopted by Buonaparte, when he re-established the Gallican church in 1802, and it ought long ago to have been adopted in Ireland.

When I had nearly finished my reply, the Duke of Grafton, to whom I sent each sheet as I composed it, wrote to me in the kindest manner, begging me to consider whether I would venture to publish it: every Christian, he said, ought to think himself obliged to me for it; but he was certain I never should be forgiven it. I thanked His Grace for his kind attention, but told him, at the same time, that no interested consideration should hold me back. How, said I to him in my letter, how shall I answer this at the tribunal of Christ—You saw the corruption of my Church, you had some ability to attempt a reform, but secular considerations choked your integrity—if I should now undo what I have done? I accordingly published the pamphlet under the title of, "Considerations on the Expediency of revising the Liturgy and Articles of the Church of England, by a consistent Protestant." Though my name was not affixed to this publication, and every precaution was taken to conceal its author, yet it was very soon generally attributed to me.

I had at the time, some conversation with the Duke of Grafton on the propriety of commencing a reform, by the introduction of a Bill into the House of Lords, for expunging the Athanasian Creed from our Liturgy; and we had, in a manner, settled to do it; but the strange turn which the French Revolution took about that period, and the general abhorrence of all innovations, which its atrocities excited, induced us to postpone our design, and no fit opportunity has yet offered for resuming it, nor probably will offer itself, in my time. In answer to a letter from the Duke of Grafton, in which, among other things, he informed me that Dr. Priestley had publicly said that he *knew* the pamphlet here mentioned was written by the Bishop of Landaff, I sent the following note:—

"Dr. PRIESTLEY cannot *know* the author; on the day I dined at Lord Lansdowne's, there were present Kippis and Price, and many Dissenters: the conversation once turned on the subject of the pamphlet, and it is possible that my mode of

expression, which no doubt was particularly marked, might give an hint to those gentlemen. But I really am little concerned about the matter; and, if I thought that owning it, in the present state of the business, would not impede, rather than promote, the progress of the good cause we have in hand, I would not, from any private consideration, shrink from putting my name to it. The reasoning of the pamphlet you sent me is perfectly just, but prejudice cannot be subdued by reason. I remember a Lambeth chaplain once maintaining, in the Divinity-Schools, the necessity of excluding Dissenters from public offices; I pressed him with proper arguments; at length he was forced to acknowledge, that the greater the integrity, and the greater the ability, any man had, the more unfit was he for a public office, if he did not think in every point with the Established Church. There I let the dispute end: it was impossible to rise higher in the scale of absurdity. I concur with Your Grace in wishing the motion (respecting the expunction of the Athanasian Creed

from the Liturgy) to be made, and notice of making it to be given in the way you mention. No distance or business shall hinder me from appearing in my place in the House of Lords, on the day the point shall be debated, and standing up with my best ability in support of your motion. You thought of mentioning the subject to the Archbishop of Canterbury; I consider that as a candid proceeding, suited to the importance of the subject; and I suggest to Your Grace's consideration a circumstance, of which you can form a much better judgment than I can,—Whether it would not be proper to mention it to the King in the first instance. The Windsor anecdote would induce me to think that the King would have no objection, and his concurrence would facilitate the measure. But if he should object, it may then admit a deliberation, whether, *in foro conscientiæ*, Your Grace should proceed. I cannot flatter myself that any little publications of mine can have been instrumental in turning Your Grace's attention to religious studies, but I am happy in the event of your appli-

cation. A future state is the most important consideration that can affect a human mind, and if the Gospel is not true, of that state I can have no expectation.

"I am, &c.

"R. Landaff."

The Windsor anecdote, here alluded to, was told me by the late Doctor Heberden:—The clergyman there, on a day when the Athanasian Creed was to be read, began with *Whosoever will be saved*, &c.; the King, who usually responded with a loud voice, was silent; the minister repeated, in an higher tone, his *Whosoever;* the King continued silent; at length the Apostles' Creed was repeated by the minister, and the King followed him throughout with a distinct and audible voice.

I certainly dislike the *imposition* of all creeds formed by human authority; though I do not dislike them, as useful summaries of what *their compilers believe* to be true, either in natural or revealed religion.

As to natural religion, the creeds of the

most distinguished philosophers, from *Plato* and *Cicero* to *Leibnitz* and *Clarke*, are extremely various, with respect to the origin of things—the existence and attributes, natural and moral, of the Supreme Being—the natural mortality or immortality of the human soul—the liberty and necessity of human actions—the principle of virtue, and other important points. And, as to revealed religion, though all its doctrines are expressed in one book, yet such a diversity of interpretations has been given to the same passages of Scripture, that not only individuals, but whole churches, have formed to themselves different creeds, and introduced them into their forms of worship. The Greek church admits not into its ritual either the Apostles' Creed, or the Athanasian, but merely the Nicene. The Episcopal church in America admits the Nicene and the Apostles' Creed, but rejects the Athanasian. The church of England admits the whole three into its Liturgy; and some of the foreign Protestant churches admit none but the Apostles'. These, and other creeds which might be mentioned, are all of human fabrication;

they oblige conscience, as far as they are conformable to Scripture, and of that conformity every man must judge for himself. This liberty of private judgment is recognised by our church (notwithstanding subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles) when, in the service for the ordering of priests, it proposes this question:—"Are you determined, out of the said Scriptures, to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing, as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which *you shall be persuaded* may be concluded and proved by the Scriptures?"

In March, 1791, I wrote to Mr. Pitt, that, as I was then going into Westmoreland, I should have no opportunity of delivering, in the House of Lords, my sentiments on the Catholic Bill, which was then pending in the Commons, and that, on that account, I took the liberty of sending him the following hint:—"Might it not be proper to introduce into the Oath of Protestation, a declaration of this kind?—*And that we believe salvation is not restricted*

to the members of the church of Rome.—Whilst the doctrine of there being no salvation out of the Romish pale is maintained, the Catholics have such a motive for making proselytes as belongs not to Protestants, and it is a motive which must operate with great force on the mind of every sincere Papist. I am apprehensive that Catholic schools will become numerous; the glare of ceremonies will fascinate the minds of the common people; and the doctrine of absolution, and of praying souls out of purgatory, will be palatable to many. I am afraid of Popery, because, where it has the power, it assumes the right of persecution, and whilst it believes that in afflicting the body, it saves the soul of a convert, I do not see how it can abandon the idea of the utility of persecution. If schools are allowed for the Catholics at *home*, what is to become of the sums, which have been appropriated by the English Catholics, to the maintenance of foreign seminaries? "I am, &c."

My detestation of the intolerance of the

church of Rome, and of the uncharitableness of its doctrine, respecting the final damnation of those whom it calls heretics, occasioned my writing the above note to Mr. Pitt. The indulgence, however, which was then granted to the Protesting Catholics met with my hearty approbation; for though I disliked some of their religious principles, I entertained no doubt of the sincerity of their political protestation. Whether many converts will be made to Popery in this country, is a question not capable of immediate decision; but that the apprehension of its influence over vulgar minds is not wholly chimerical, may appear from what *Forster* has said in his travels: —"I have heard Mr. Schwartz, the Christian missionary on the coast of Coromandel, as pious a priest as ever preached the Gospel, and as good a man as ever adorned society, complain, that many of his Indian proselytes, disgusted at his church's want of glitter and bustle, take an early opportunity of going over to the Popish communion, where they are congenially gratified by the painted scenery, by relics, charms, and the blaze of fire-works."

About this time I received the two following letters, from gentlemen, unknown to me, in Ireland:—

"My Lord,

"UNKNOWN as I am to Your Lordship, and without the honour of an introduction, permit me, in this method, to express my obligations for your labours in the cause of Christianity, and the benefit which I in particular have derived from them:—inestimable indeed!

"Young and inexperienced, by the impious jests and contagious example of profligate associates, I at length abandoned the religious principles in which I had been early instructed, and with sorrow confess imbibed those of infidelity. In this deplorable situation I met with Your Lordship's Theological Tracts, and Apology for Christianity. By a careful perusal of both, I am overpowered with evidence and conviction; so that with me the truth of our most holy religion stands on a foundation infinitely firmer than that of any remote fact whatever—*it is the power of God unto salvation.*

" In consequence of this happy change, I hope I am solicitous to conform my practice to the divine precepts of the Gospel, for I have lately complied with our blessed Saviour's dying command.

" Under omnipotent influence, your writings have been powerfully efficacious in dissipating the gloom of scepticism in which I once was so involved. But plain and unlettered as I am, gratitude must supersede encomium. I however sincerely pray, that you may at least receive an approbation the most significant,—Well done, enter into the joy of your Lord—when, in the noble language of Scripture,—They who have turned many to righteousness shall shine as the stars for ever and ever.

" I have the honour to be,

" Your Lordship's much obliged

" And most obedient servant,

" * * *."

Irvine, Nov. 17, 1792.

" My Lord,

" Having perused with great pleasure Your Lordship's Apology for Christianity,

addressed to Edward Gibbon, Esquire, author of the History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, I am proud to acknowledge, that I have received much satisfaction and information on certain points in it, which I had not before observed in any writer on the subject.

"I confess I was particularly struck with your force of reasoning and conclusive arguments in opposition to a very common objection brought by Free-thinkers of the age, against the Mosaic account of the world's age, especially since the publication of Mr. Brydone's Travels through Sicily and Malta, wherein arguments are made use of by the Canon Recupero, to prove the world to be, I think, eight thousand years older than the Mosaic account; but which Your Lordship has entirely overturned, by a comparison of Mount Vesuvius, which proves that a stratum of natural earth is not so long forming on a surface of lava as the Canon supposes.

"Although I have not the honour of being known to Your Lordship, yet I hope the well-known candour and liberality of

sentiment you possess, will pardon the freedom I take in this address, for Your Lordship's solution of a difficulty which has been frequently urged in debate against the truth of Scripture-history, and which, unfortunately for myself, my poor abilities have never been able to defend.

"I must inform Your Lordship it has been my misfortune to have been in habits of intimacy with unbelievers; who, knowing my attachment to the religious principles in which I was educated, never fail to insult my way of thinking by scoffs and sneers at some of the mysterious doctrines of the Christian religion, which they exultingly defy me to prove. No later ago than yesterday (being Sunday) a discourse of this kind took place, in which I bore a part, I will even own an unworthy part, not being able to convince the adversaries; for though a layman I exert myself in defence of what I hold sacred. The subject was, the peopling the earth after the Deluge, which, it was contended, must prove the Mosaic account to be false; as could be demonstrated by the discoveries of cele-

brated navigators, who have found islands inhabited in the South Seas, which from the ignorance of navigation in ancient times could never have had communication with any of the continents; consequently, say they, the earth must have been peopled in some other way than by those preserved in the ark.

"Now, My Lord, though I will freely acknowledge I might obtain the sentiments of some very worthy and sensible men in this kingdom on the subject, yet I must own I am so partial to your works, especially standing so high as Your Lordship does in the republic of letters, as leaves me no doubt of a most satisfactory elucidation. It would confer a lasting obligation if Your Lordship will condescend to favour me with your sentiments on the above subject.

"I have the honour to be,

"With the highest esteem,

"Your Lordship's obedient,

"And very humble servant,

"***."

I forbear giving the name and address of

the author of the above letter; but as it seemed to be written with a serious intention, I thought it became me not to overlook it, and I immediately sent him the following answer:—

"Calgarth Park, Sept. 30, 1791.

"Sir,

"Bad health has obliged me to abandon all literary pursuits, and to endeavour to restore, by the indolence of a country-life, a broken constitution. In this retirement I have, at present, no books of any kind; yet I will not decline answering, in the best manner I can without them, the main subject of your letter; entreating you not to suffer your mind to be diverted from the rectitude of its persuasion, though I should not be able to reply satisfactorily to your enquiry.

"The tenth chapter of Genesis is one of the most ancient, one of the most authentic, and one of the most valuable records in the world. Its antiquity cannot be denied by any one in the least skilled in chronology. No person has ever questioned its authenticity; it is universally allow-

ed to have been written by the author of the Pentateuch; and as to its value, it is inestimable; for it explains to us the origins of nations, *Medes, Assyrians, Persians, Grecians, Egyptians, Lydians, Syrians,* all the mighty nations of antiquity, concerning the origin of whom the poets told senseless tales, and the historians gave but uncertain conjectures (as may be seen by consulting Herodotus and other writers of profane history); these are all clearly described in Sacred History, as distinct scions springing from one common stock—*Noah.*

"*Bochart, Huetius, Goguet, Le Clerc, Bryant,* and innumerable other authors have treated this subject with such perspicuity, that it is a shame for any unbeliever to be ignorant of what they have said; and it will be impossible for him to deny the truth of their argumentation. They differ somewhat from each other as to the particular regions in which some of the grandsons of Noah were settled; but this general conclusion is established by them all,—that all the nations of which history has given any account, have originated from *Shem, Ham,* or *Japhet.* Now this conclu-

sion, as to the source from which all the continents were peopled, being established, (and I think it is fully established even if we take into the account the Chinese, Japanese, and other eastern nations,) why should we suffer a little difficulty, as to the manner in which the islands were peopled, to stagger our faith in Scripture-history?

"If my memory does not fail me, it is related by *Hornius,* in his book, "*De Originibus Americanis,*" that it was proposed by some superstitious people, as a question which none but a man possessed by the devil could answer, How was America peopled? yet the question can now be answered without the aid of supernatural assistance. In like manner future discoveries of navigators may enable us to answer the question concerning the peopling of the islands in the South Sea, though it should be deemed unanswerable at present.

"I am far from believing that question to be unanswerable at present, and think it probable that *Forster,* the most philosophical of our late circumnavigators, has written something on the subject; but I cannot

say with certainty whether he has or not; it may be worth your while to consult his work.

"To me there appear to be two ways, by which the present islands may have been peopled: there may be other ways, but two strike me as obvious ones; by navigation, and by inundations of the sea.

"Though the compass, and other improvements in the art of sailing, have enabled the moderns to go from any one point to another on the surface of the ocean, with as much certainty as they travel from city to city on the surface of the earth; yet we must not suppose that the ancients were so wholly unskilled in that art, as never to have ventured by *design* out of the sight of land. The trade of the Phenicians, Syrians, and Carthaginians, is a proof to the contrary. Tempests and trade-winds might have carried merchant vessels beyond their *designed* limits; and thus it appears not unreasonable to suppose, that it was accidental or designed sailing which peopled England from Gaul, Ireland from the northern continent, Japan from Eastern

Tartary or China; similar causes might have peopled the islands from the nearest continents.

"Voltaire, I think, in some part of his writings, says—that God planted men in different regions of the earth as he planted trees; insinuating that the doctrine of a common origin of mankind is an incredible story. A similar extravagance of assertion is not uncommon in the mouths of other unbelievers. I call it extravagance of assertion, because (putting all professional bias out of the question) I am firmly convinced, that the account given by Moses of the manner in which the earth became inhabited after the Deluge, is confirmed by the profane history of the remotest periods, and by the present circumstances of mankind on the surface of the earth.

"Another manner in which islands may have become peopled, respects the manner in which they may have been formed; they may, in remote ages, have been connected with continents, and separated therefrom by inundations of the ocean; and having been peopled before they were separated

we are under no necessity of having recourse even to navigation, as a mean of stocking them with inhabitants.

"Had Great Britain been connected with France, where the Straits of Dover now are, or with Ireland at the Mull of Galloway, we should have no difficulty in accounting for the peopling of Great Britain and Ireland. A junction of the Red Sea with the Mediterranean would make Africa an island; and if the Isthmus of Darien should sink into the bowels of the earth, America would be separated into two islands, or into more than two, according to the height and extent of the inundation which would take place, on the junction of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. I mention these circumstances, because it is probable that changes as great as these have taken place, and are now taking place on different parts of the surface of the globe. Naturalists are agreed that Iceland, which is as large as Ireland, is entirely a volcanic production; it has been raised from the bottom of the ocean; can we think it improbable then, (to say

nothing of Plato's testimony, concerning a continent being swallowed up by the ocean) that the sea may have inundated various parts of the earth, and that the higher lands, constituting the present islands, may have been peopled by the inhabitants who escaped the inundation.

"But in whatever way the islands of the South Sea may have become inhabited, the similarity (I do not say the identity) of the languages spoken in them all, leads us to believe that they have all had one common origin; and the time I conjecture will come, when the mother-language of all the various dialects spoken in these islands will be discovered in some part of Asia.

"There is another argument which, with me, has great weight in establishing the fact, that these inhabitants have had continental progenitors, and the argument is this,— Their drums, spears, bows, helmets; their nets, hooks, hatchets; most of their instruments, warlike and domestic, as well as many of their customs, civil, military, and religious, have a strong resemblance to what we read concerning the instruments

and customs of other nations. I forbear dilating on this subject, the mention of it will be sufficient to show you its importance.

"As to the mysteries of the Christian religion, it is neither your concern nor mine to explain them; for if they are mysteries, they cannot be explained. But our time may be properly employed in enquiring whether there are so many mysteries in Christianity as the Deists say there are. Many doctrines have been imposed on the Christian world as doctrines of the Gospel, which have no foundation whatever in Scripture. Instead of defending these doctrines, it is the duty of a real disciple of Jesus Christ to reprobate them as gangrenous excrescences, corrupting the fair form of genuine Christianity.

"That Jesus Christ lived, died, rose from the dead, and ascended into heaven, are facts established by better historical testimony, than that Alexander fought Darius, conquered Persia, and passed into India. But on the resurrection of Christ all our hopes as men, and our obligations

as Christians, are founded. And if we have as great or greater reason to believe that fact, than we have to believe almost any fact recorded in history, we shall act irrationally, and, in a matter of such high concern, foolishly and culpably, if we withhold our assent to it; and if we do assent to it, our duty is obvious.

"With much good will towards you, and with a request that you will excuse this hasty performance,

"I remain your obedient servant,

"R. LANDAFF."

I sent my correspondent's letter and the answer to the Duke of Grafton on the 12th October, 1791, with the subjoined note:—

"My dear Lord Duke,

"WITH very little knowledge of the subject I am become a farmer; but that Your Grace may not think me a mere farmer, I send for your perusal a letter, and my answer to it; there is nothing in either of them worthy your attention, but I know your mind has taken a turn

for such speculations; and I flatter myself that you will be glad to hear that I am in tolerable health, though not free from the malady which has so long oppressed me.

"I have not heard from you since the Birmingham riots; at the time they happened I sat down to write to Your Grace, and to say, that even my littleness would stretch itself to an hundred pounds subscription, if the friends of Dr. Priestley should think of consoling him, in that way, for the loss he had sustained, and the chagrin any mind, less elevated than his own, must have experienced from such harsh and unmerited treatment. On second thoughts I put the letter I had written into the fire, lest such a proposal, coming from a bishop, should have tended to inflame matters, by increasing the unchristian choler of high-churchmen, which has already produced much mischief.

"We live in singular times. No history, ancient or modern, furnishes an example similar to what has happened in France; an example of a whole people (the exceptions are not worthy of notice) divesting

themselves of the prejudices of birth and education, in civil and religious concerns, and adopting the principles of philosophy and good sense.

" I speak only of the general outline of their constitution; piddling objections may be made to particular parts, and experience will point out the necessity of reconsidering many things. But notwithstanding all the ridicule which apostate Whigs have attempted to throw on the rights of man, such rights are founded in nature; they exist antecedent to, and independent of civil society; and the French constitution is the only one in the world which has deliberately asserted these rights, and supported them in their full extent.

" In England we want not a fundamental revolution, but we certainly want a reform both in the civil and ecclesiastical part of our constitution; men's minds, however, I think, are not yet generally prepared for admitting its necessity. A reformer of Luther's temper and talents would, in five years, persuade the people to compel the parliament to abolish tithes, to extinguish pluralities, to enforce resi-

dence, to confine episcopacy to the over-seeing of dioceses, to expunge the Athanasian Creed from our Liturgy, to free Dissenters from test acts, and the ministers of the Establishment from subscription to human articles of faith.—These, and other matters respecting the Church, ought to be done. I want not courage to attempt doing what I think ought to be done, and I am not held back by considerations of personal interest; but my temper is peaceable, I dislike contention, and trust that the still voice of reason will at length be heard.

"As to the civil state, it cannot continue long as it is. One minister, in subserviency to the will of his master, doubles the national debt and dismembers the empire, and is instantly taken into the confidence of those who threatened to take his head. Another expends millions on measures grounded on his own ambition, insolence, or temerity, and finds means of inducing a great majority in both Houses of Parliament to place confidence in his wisdom.

"The people will in time see that they

have no reason to place confidence in any party; that every party, in its turn, ennobles its opulent friends, and enriches its poorer supporters, at the public expense. But I will forbear politics; I love my country, and cannot see its decline in principle, and the increase of that corruption which must undo it, without regret.

"I am, &c.

"R. Landaff."

In the beginning of 1792, I published a Charge which I had delivered to my clergy in the preceding June; in this Charge I had touched upon unpopular subjects—the advantages which would probably result to human society from the French Revolution; which was not at that time dishonoured by the events which soon followed, and which have hitherto continued to disgrace it—and the injustice and impolicy of our Test and Corporation Acts. The Charge had been wholly misrepresented, and copies of the misrepresentation had been handed about at the tables of bishops and of judges. I thought fit to publish the

Charge, with the following advertisement prefixed to it:—" After I had delivered the following Charge to the clergy of my diocese, I was requested by many of them, as well as by several of the laity who heard it, to publish it. I had no reason for declining a compliance with their request, except the opinion I entertained of there being nothing in the Charge meriting the public notice. I have lately heard that a written paper, purporting to contain the substance of my Charge, has been circulated with, perhaps, *unbecoming* if not *uncharitable* industry. The circulators of that paper will now have an opportunity of knowing (what a little candour might have taught them to expect), how defective memory is in giving a just account of a discourse of some length. Few men are less moved by unmerited censure or less solicitous in repelling groundless calumny than myself; but I conceive it to be a Christian duty to suffer no man to continue in an error when it is in my power to remove it. Under the influence of that opinion I am obliged to trouble the world with this publication."

This proceeding had a proper effect; it quashed the reports which had been spread, and it made some persons of high distinction ashamed of their credulity, in giving ear to them, and of their conduct in propagating them. I was compelled, as it were, to publish this Charge, but I was not sorry that an occasion was given me of delivering my sentiments on a matter of great importance.

I will just state to the reader how I argued myself into the adoption of the opinion, advanced in this Charge relative to the Dissenters. Had I consulted my interest, I should certainly have been silent on this point; for who knows not how little a bishop's interest is connected with his opposition to the avowed sentiments of a minister? and Mr Pitt had repeatedly avowed his—that the Test-Act ought not to be repealed. Whether this avowal was made by Mr. Pitt in conformity to his own opinion, or in subservience to the opinion of another, was then and has still been with me a matter of doubt. There have been

ministers in all ages who have carried on measures contrary to their judgment. If such pliancy proceeds from a diffidence of their own ability, it is to be commended; but if it proceeds, as it generally does, from a reluctance to relinquish their places, it is highly dishonourable to themselves and ruinous to their country.

There appear to me but two reasons for excluding any honest man from eligibility to public office, — want of capacity to serve the office, and want of attachment to the civil constitution of the country. That the Dissenters want capacity, will not be asserted; that they want attachment to the civil constitution of the country, is asserted by many, but proved by none. On this point the whole question turns. If the Dissenters have secret views of undermining the civil constitution, of introducing a republican form of government in the place of that which, notwithstanding its defects, we at present so happily enjoy, the Test-Act ought not to be repealed; and if they have no such views, its continuance is an

oppression. Whether they have or have not such views cannot be known from the affirmation of their enemies on the one hand, or from the denial of their friends on the other: on both sides it may be said, *Quiescat lingua, interroga vitam.* Now the history of the conduct of the Dissenters since the Revolution, nay at and since the Restoration, proves (to me at least it proves) that they have no such views.

The Dissenters are neither Tories nor Republicans, but friends to the principles of the Revolution. Notwithstanding the virulence of Mr. Burke's invective against him, I give entire credit to what Dr. Price has said of himself and of the Dissenters, in the following extract from his Sermon preached, April, 1787, before the supporters of a new academical institution among Protestant Dissenters:—" I cannot help taking this " opportunity to remove a very groundless " suspicion with respect to myself, by add-" ing, that so far am I from preferring a " government purely republican, that I " look upon our own constitution of go-

" vernment as better adapted than any " other to this country, and in theory excel- " lent. I have said in theory, for, in con- " sequence of the increase of corruption and " the miserable inadequateness of our re- " presentation, it is chiefly the theory and " form of our constitution that we possess; " and this I reckon our first, and worst, " and greatest grievance. What I say of " myself I believe to be true of the whole " body of British subjects among Protes- " tant Dissenters. I know not *one* among " them who would not tremble at the " thought of changing into a democracy " our mixed form of government, or who " has any other wish with respect to it " than to restore it to purity and vigour, " by removing the defects in our represen- " tation, and establishing that independ- " ence of the three states on one another, " in which its essence consists."

But it may be said that I have not stated the whole question, inasmuch as the Dissenters are enemies to the Church-establishment, and that the State is so *allied* to

the Church that he who is unfriendly to the one must wish the subversion of both. I think this reasoning is not just: a man may certainly wish for a change in an ecclesiastical establishment, without wishing for a change in the civil constitution of a country. An Episcopalian, for instance, may wish to see bishops established in all Scotland, without wishing Scotland to become a republic; and he may wish that episcopacy may be established in all the American states, without wishing that monarchy may be established in any of them. The protection of life, liberty, and property is not inseparably or exclusively connected with any particular form of church-government. The blessings of civil society depend upon the proper execution of good laws, and upon the good morals of the people; but no one will attempt to prove, that the laws and morals of the people may not be as good in Germany, Swisserland, or Scotland, under a Presbyterian, as in England or France under an episcopal form of church-government.

But it is thought that, were the Test and

Corporation Acts repealed, the Dissenters would get a footing in some of the boroughs returning members to parliament. The Dissenters have, at present, a considerable influence in many boroughs; but there is little probability that, were all legal obstacles to their eligibility to public offices removed, they would ever be able to overcome the influence of government, the influence of the aristocracy, and the influence of the Church, in the majority of the boroughs in this kingdom. But, admitting so very improbable an occurrence to take place, what then? Why then a majority of boroughs would return Dissenters to sit in parliament. Dissenters are allowed to sit in parliament at present; the danger, then, such as it is, arises not from Dissenters having seats in parliament, but from the number of dissenting members being increased. But that the number of dissenting members should ever be so far increased as to constitute a majority of the House of Commons is to me quite an improbable circumstance; I think it a far more likely event that, all restraints being removed, the Dissenters will insensibly be-

come Churchmen. Suppose, however, even that improbable circumstance to take place, and that a majority of the House of Commons has ceased to be Churchmen—what then? Why then the House of Commons may present to the House of Lords a Bill for changing the constitution of the Church of England into that of the Church of Scotland. Be it so—what then? Why then the House of Commons will compel the House of Lords to agree to such a Bill; this does not follow; I know not any legal or probable means of effecting such a compulsion; but for the sake of coming to a conclusion, let it be admitted that, at some distant period of which no man can form a reasonable conjecture, the House of Lords would, by compulsion or choice, agree with the House of Commons, and that the King would agree with them both in establishing Presbytery in the room of Episcopacy—what then? Why then the present form of the Church of England would be changed into another! And is this all?—this the catastrophe of so many tragical forebodings—this the issue of so many im-

probable contingencies—this the result of so much unchristian contention—this a cause for continuing distinctions, by which the persons and properties of peaceful citizens are exposed to the fiery zeal of a senseless rabble?—A great *Protestant* nation does not return to *Popery*—a great *Christian* nation does not apostatise to *Paganism* or *Mahometanism*; it simply adopts an ecclesiastical constitution different from what it had before. What is there in this to alarm any man who liberally thinks with the late Dr. Powell, that there is nothing in the regimen of the Church of England, or in that of the Church of Scotland, repugnant either to the natural rights of man, or to the word of God:—*Ecclesiastici regiminis in Angliâ et in Scotiâ constituti, neutra forma aut juri hominum naturali aut verbo Dei repugnat.*

This improbable change in the Church-establishment, and a change at the same time not to be lamented, if brought about by a change in the sentiments of the nation, appeared to me to be an uncertain and distant evil of far less magnitude, than

what might be expected from a continuance of the Test-Act. I was afraid that the Dissenters, believing themselves to be ill-treated at home, might be induced gradually to carry their wealth, industry, and manufacturing skill into some other country; or, if motives of prudence hindered them from adopting such a measure, that they would retain a grudge against the government, and be ready to show their displeasure whenever an opportunity of doing it with effect might present itself.

About this time I wrote the letter, from which the subjoined extract is made, to an intimate friend, in answer to one I had received from him :—

" My religion is not founded, I hope, in presumption, but in piety. I cannot look upon the Author of my existence in any other light than as the most commiserating parent; not extreme to mark what is done amiss, not implacable, not revengeful, not disposed to punish past offences when the heart abhors them, but ready, with the ut-

most benignity, to receive into his favour every repentant sinner.

"By the constitution of nature, which may properly be considered as indicating the will of God, all excess in sensual indulgences tends to the depravation of the mind, and to the debilitation of the body, and may, on that account, be esteemed repugnant to the will of God. This repugnancy is made more apparent by the Gospel. Now, all our happiness in this world and in the next depending ultimately on the will of God, every one may see a moral necessity of conforming his actions to that will. But, as the will of God has no degree of selfishness in it, is not excited on any occasion to gratify the resentment or any other passion of the Supreme Being (as often happens in the will of man), I cannot but believe, that a change of temper, accompanied by a change of conduct, is all that God requires of us in order to be restored, after our greatest transgressions, to his perfect acceptance.

"We know not in what the felicity of the next world will consist, but we do

know that it will not consist in the gratification of our present senses; yet God is not an harsh Master, for he hath furnished us with abundant means of present enjoyment; and had every enjoyment of sense been sinful, he certainly would neither have given us senses nor objects adapted to them; he hath done both; and he requires from us such a moderation in the use of them, as may preserve our minds from being so addicted to them, as to prevent us from having any relish for the duties of benevolence and holiness, in the exercise of which it is not improbable that our future happiness may consist.

"Every denunciation of God against intemperance in the pleasures of sense, against injustice in our intercourse with mankind, against impiety towards himself, seems to proceed from his extreme affection for us, by which he warns us from a course of conduct, the final issue of which we cannot, in this state, comprehend.

"The love of God casteth out fear; let us once bottom our principle of action on the desire of obeying Him, and though we

may be impelled by our passions to occasional deviations from what is right, yet this obliquity of conduct will not continue long; the hope of living under his fatherly kindness and protection will bring us to a rational sense of duty, to a just confidence of acceptance with Him.

"There is much mechanism in our constitution; our thoughts are influenced by the state of the body to a degree, and in a manner, which *no* philosophy can explain. A bodily infirmity produces in the minds of some men a dejection of spirits, a despondency of sentiment, which other men, with equal or superior cause for dejection and despondency, and under apparently equal bodily infirmities, feel not at all. It is difficult, perhaps impossible, for beings such as we are, to account for this difference, but we may be persuaded of this, that God who made us knows this diversity of temper, and will make a kind and fatherly allowance for it, and not impute more than is just to him whose mind is oppressed by unreasonable apprehensions, originating in corporal imbecility.

"I have read the 'Vindiciæ,' and have reason to rejoice that so little can be said against a Charge, written with no intention of being printed. My opponents are indebted to the pride or the placability of my temper for their security; I could chastise them, but I partly disdain the task as thinking it beneath me, and I partly decline it from not wishing to cherish an unchristian disposition in myself, or to excite it in others."

In April, this year (1792), an hundred gentlemen formed themselves into a society, under the title of "The Friends of the People," for the express purpose of procuring a parliamentary reform. The minister at the outset of his political life had been as zealous as any one for this reform, but he had either really changed his opinion respecting it, or now yielded to the apprehensions or designs of the closet; for he took an early opportunity of damping the exertions of the Friends of the People, by endeavouring to make them participate in the odium which had, not unjustly, fallen

upon some other societies connected with the promoters of the French Revolution. On the 21st of May, a Proclamation was issued by His Majesty against seditious meetings and criminal correspondencies; the Friends of the People were too respectable to be mentioned, by name, in the Proclamation; but it was generally understood to have been principally levelled against them. The two Houses of Parliament, and the city of London, set the example of addressing the King on the occasion, and it was intimated, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, to the Bishops of his province, that addresses were expected from them. I drew up the following for my diocese. I could not bring myself to praise the Proclamation, because it opposed what I have ever thought absolutely necessary for the preservation of the constitution: —

"Most Gracious Sovereign,

"We the Bishop, Archdeacon and Chapter, and the Clergy of the diocese of Landaff, humbly tender to Your Majesty our strongest assurances of loyalty to Your

Majesty's person, of attachment to your family, of zeal for the principles of the Revolution, and of our utter abhorrence of every attempt to subvert the constitution in church and state then established, and since then improved.

"The improvements which the constitution has received—in the judges being rendered more independent, in the mode of determining contested elections, in the repeal of certain penal statutes respecting Protestant and Catholic dissenters, in ascertaining the rights of juries, and in other ways—have been more numerous and important during Your Majesty's reign, than during the reigns of all your predecessors since the Revolution.

"We are thankful for what has been done; and, without encouraging improper modes of innovation in other matters, still, perhaps, requiring an amendment, we trust, that what is wanting to render our constitution perfect and permanent will be accomplished by the deliberate wisdom of the legislature, rather than by the rash violence of democratic faction.

"When we compare our situation as citizens of a free state, with that of those who are either struggling for that liberty which we enjoy, or groaning under that slavery which we are in no danger of, we cannot but set the highest value on that form of civil government from which our happiness is derived; and we beg leave, in the most serious and solemn manner, to declare to Your Majesty, that in proportion to this our estimation of its worth, will be our zeal for the preservation of the constitution."

Soon after the dissolution of the Constituent, or first National Assembly of France, I dined at Earl Stanhope's (it was the only time I ever had that honour), in company with the Bishop of Autun, and several other principal Frenchmen, who had been members of that Assembly. Having witnessed the respect with which Lord Stanhope treated these gentlemen, and with which his Lordship was treated by them, I was induced to write the following letter to him, in the autumn of 1792, after the

King of France had been committed to the Temple on the 13th of August. I had no great expectation of success attending the application of an individual, buried in the wilds of Westmoreland, yet, knowing that the greatest events had often sprung from the slightest causes, I was determined to make an effort—feeble, but sincere!—to prevent that horrid butchery of the Royal Family, which afterwards took place, to the eternal disgrace of France. It has excited the detestation of the present, and will be followed by the execration of all succeeding ages.

"My Lord,

"Your opinion will have great weight with the National Assembly. I wish you could persuade them to do an act, which would throw a veil over the late brutality of their populace; establish their new Republic on a solid foundation; and transmit their names with immortal honour to posterity.

"Instead of bringing their King to a trial, let them give him his liberty; assign

him one of his palaces for his residence; settle upon himself and his posterity an hundred thousand pounds a-year, with a permission to spend it in France, or in any other country, subject to forfeiture on any act of treason against the *Republic.*

"I will not trouble Your Lordship with describing how such an act of magnanimity and (may I not call it?) of justice and humanity, would conciliate the minds of all men to what appears to me an *axiom*—That the majority of every nation in the world has, at all times, a right to change their civil government. The French, by such a proceeding, would do more nobly by the Capets than the Romans did by the Tarquins, or than the English did by the Stuarts.

"I am, &c.

"R. Landaff."

Whether Lord Stanhope ever troubled himself to suggest this hint to any of the National Assembly, I know not. His answer to me (Oct. 29, 1792,) was, that—"New-made discoveries of the treachery,

perfidy, and duplicity, of Louis XVI. had within these few days, rendered the resentment against him more violent." Of the truth of this charge against the unfortunate Monarch, I am an incompetent judge; I remember, I thought at the time, that the constitution to which he had sworn was not first broken by himself in using his *veto*, but by the Jacobins in exciting an insurrection against him for having used it.

Notwithstanding all that has happened in France, I cannot but adhere to the political axiom mentioned in my letter to Lord Stanhope, and which Marmontel in his posthumous works, published in 1805, has adopted (vol. iii. p. 256.)—*La Révolution Française auroit eu, dans l'ancienne Rome, un exemple honorable à suivre. Louis XVI. n'avoit aucun des vices des Tarquins, et l'on n'avoit à l'accuser ni d'orgueil ni de violence: sans autre raison que d'être lasse de ses Rois, la France pouvoit les expatrier avec toute leur race.*—I do not agree with this author that the example of Rome was honourable; it would have been so, had an ample pro-

vision been made for Tarquin and his family.

In January, 1793, I published a Sermon entitled, "The Wisdom and Goodness of God in having made both Rich and Poor; with an Appendix respecting the then circumstances of Great Britain and France." A strong spirit of insubordination and discontent was, at that time, prevalent in Great Britain; the common people were, in every village, talking about liberty and equality without understanding the terms. I thought it not improper to endeavour to abate this revolutionary ferment, by informing the understandings of those who excited it.

The King (at his levee) complimented me in the warmest terms, in the hearing of the then Lord Dartmouth, on (he was pleased to say) the conciseness, clearness, and utility of this little publication; and the then Archbishop of Canterbury afterwards informed me, that His Majesty had spoken to him of the publication in the same terms, two months before.

On this occasion, when the King was praising what I had written, I said to him,—"I love to come forward in a moment of danger." His reply was so quick and proper that I will put it down,—"I see you do, and it is a mark of a man of high spirit." His Majesty's reception of me at his levee, to which I went once, or, at the most, twice a year, was always so complimentary, that notwithstanding the pestilent prevalence of court-duplicity, I cannot bring myself to believe that he was my enemy; though he has suffered me to remain, through life, worse provided for than any bishop on the bench. I owe nothing to the Crown but the bishoprick of Landaff, and that has never paid the increase of expense incident to my change of station.

An hatred of the Whigs has, I think, shown itself during the whole of the reign, and I probably have come in for my share of it; for I have never made any secret of my opinion—that the same principles which placed the House of Brunswick on the throne of these kingdoms, are necessary to

keep it there; and that all attempts to introduce into this great country the miserable despotism of the petty principalities of Germany, from whence our kings generally take their wives, would end in the deserved disgrace and ruin of those who make them.

THE TANJORE MAHARAJA SERFOGI'S SARASVATI MAHAL.

END OF VOL. I.

J. M'Creery, Printer,
Black-Horse-Court, London.